arXiv:1406.7870v2 [math.CO] 2 Jul 2014

Multicoloured Random Graphs: Constructions and Symmetry

Sam Tarzi
London, England

Copyright

© 2014 Sam Tarzi
All Rights Reserved

Sam Tarzi is identified as the author of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or stored in a retrieval system, nor transmitted in any form or by any means - digital scanning, mechanical, photo-copying, recording, or by any other media - without prior permission of the copyright owner.

Every effort has been made to trace copyright ownership and permissions are confirmed in the text. Any omission brought to the notice of the publishers will be acknowledged in future impressions.

Abstract

Multicoloured Random Graphs: Constructions and Symmetry

This is a research monograph on constructions of, and group actions on countable homogeneous graphs, concentrating particularly on the simple random graph and its edge-coloured variants. Taking this family of graphs as our starting point, we study various aspects of the graphs, but the emphasis has been on illuminating those groups that are supported by these graphs, together with links with other structures such as lattices, topologies & filters, rings & algebras, metric spaces, sets & models, Moufang loops and monoids. All graphs that we consider have a countable number of vertices, but some of the associated groups have uncountable order. The large amount of background material included serves as an introduction to the theories that are used to produce the new results. The large number of references should help in making this a resource for anyone interested in beginning research in this or allied fields. Our exposition is intended to be thorough rather than encyclopedic.

The countably infinite random graph which we denote by $\mathfrak{R}$ is known to be unique up to isomorphism; in other words a countable random graph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ with probability 1. Its most common variant is as a simple graph, thus having only two possible adjacencies, edges and non-edges, no loops or multiple edges being permitted. As we shall see there are three equivalent ways of characterizing $\mathfrak{R}$ up to isomorphism as a countable graph, these being the so-called one-point extension property, the injection property or a combination of universality and homogeneity.

There is an obvious generalization to graphs with any finite or infinite number of different adjacency types, which we realize as colours. Our study of these generalized graphs demonstrates that whilst the basic properties such as homogeneity, universality and various stability conditions remain the same as those of $\mathfrak{R}$, the infinite-vertex m-coloured random graphs $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ for $m \geq 3$ support groups with a different structure and are associated with rings of a different structure, to those of $\mathfrak{R}$. Some of these differences are highlighted. We also devote

some attention to uncovering properties that are unique to the graph with three adjacency types which we call the *triality graph* denoting it $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. Much of the work on the random graph and its relations over the past half-century has been on combinatorial aspects of the theory, whilst our exposition focuses on complementary questions.

Dedication

In loving memory of my late father Anwar
my mother Adiba
Jacob Avner and Daniel

Contents

Copyright iii

Abstract v

Dedication vii

Preface xiii

Chapter 1. Introduction: Basic Properties of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ 1

Chapter 2. Reducts of the Random Graphs 9
1. Switchings and Switching Permutations 9
2. Two-Coloured Switching: The Finite Case 10
3. Two-Coloured Switching: The Infinite Case 12
4. Three-Coloured Reducts 16
5. Random Graphs with Coloured Vertices 23
6. Random Graphs with Forbidden Substructures 32
7. Properties of $S_{3,3}$ 36
8. The Switching Reduct for Three Colours 39
9. Switching on More Than Two Colours: The Finite Case 43
10. Switching on More Than Two Colours: The Infinite Case 46
11. Derivation of the Form of $S_{m,n}$ 49
12. Primitivity of Extended Switching Group Actions 50
13. Transitive Extensions 54

Chapter 3. Finitary Switching Groups 57
1. Basic Properties 58
2. Parity Equivalence of Coloured Graphs 62

Chapter 4. Local Switchings & Group Presentations 69
1. Local Switching of Simple Graphs 69
2. Local Switching of Multicoloured Graphs 78
3. Appendix 1: A First Presentation of $S_{m,n}$ 86
4. Appendix 2: A Second Presentation of $S_{m,n}$ 91

Chapter 5. Some Ring Theory around Random Graphs 95
1. Polynomial Algebras for Random Graphs 95

2. An Isomorphism of Two Algebras 102
3. Appendix: Cameron & Glynn Algebra Graph Isomorphisms 109

Chapter 6. Random Graphs as Homogeneous Cayley Objects 115
1. $\mathfrak{R}$ as a Cayley Graph 116
2. A Construction of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ as a Homogeneous Cayley Object 121
3. Lattice Constructions of Random Graphs 129
4. Difficulties in Directly Proving Cartan Triality of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ 133
5. Groups with Triality 140
6. Split Extension of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ 143
7. A Loop Construction of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ 146

Chapter 7. Random Graph Outer Automorphisms & Variations 159
1. On Extensions of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ 159
1.1. Introduction 159
1.2. Proof of Theorem 7.1 162
1.3. Proof of Theorem 7.2 164
2. Introducing Some Groups 165

Chapter 8. Filters, Topologies and Groups from $\mathfrak{R}$ 173
1. The Random Graph and its Relations 174
2. Neighbourhood Filters 174
3. Automorphism Groups of Neighbourhood Filters 176
4. Fixed Points on Ultrafilters 178
5. Sierpiński's Theorem 179
6. Topologies on Random Graphs 184
7. The $\mathfrak{R}$-uniform Hypergraph $\mathfrak{RHyp}$ 187
8. Stone–Čech Compactification 192
9. Other Graphs 195
10. Appendix: Graphs Spanned by $\mathfrak{R}$ 196

Chapter 9. Monoids, Graphs and $\mathfrak{R}$ 199
1. Generalizations of Graph Homogeneity 199
2. Graphs and Finite Transformation Monoids 202
3. Hulls and Cores of Infinite Graphs 205
4. Fraïssé's Theorem for HH Structures 210
5. Topological HH Monoids 212
6. Oligomorphic Monoids 217
7. Appendix: Previous Results on Monoids Supported by $\mathfrak{R}$ 223

Chapter 10. Random Graph Constructions 225
1. A Number-Theoretic Construction of $\mathfrak{R}$ 225
2. A Number-Theoretic Construction of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ 227
3. Universal Metric Spaces and $\mathfrak{R}$ 228

4. Homogeneous Integral Metric Spaces 231
5. Miscellaneous Observations 235
6. Appendix: Bounded Amorphous Sets 239
6.1. The Theorem of Baer, Schreier and Ulam for Bounded Amorphous Sets 239
6.2. Permutations of a Bounded Amorphous Set 239
6.3. The Centralizer of the Gauge Group 241

Chapter 11. Further Directions 247

Appendix A. Prerequisite Background 295
1. Permutation Groups 295
2. Model Theory 306
3. Category and Measure 314
4. Fraïssé's Theory of Relational Structures 323
5. The Random Graph $\mathfrak{R}$ 332
6. $\aleph_0$-categoricity 334
7. Mathematics and Logic 336
8. Previous Results in Multicoloured Random Graph Theory 342
9. Further Details on Random Graphs 344
10. Topology in Permutation Groups 358
11. Polynomials 367
12. Enumeration, Growth Rates and Reconstruction 373
13. Cartan Triality and Eight-Dimensional Exotica 376
14. Loop Theory and Groups with Triality 383
15. Set Theory 391
16. Number Theory 393

Appendix B. Diagrams of Algebraic Structures 397

Appendix C. Diagrams of Graph Types 399

Appendix D. Some Separation Axioms for Topological Spaces 407

Appendix E. Tables 409

Appendix F. Quotations 413

Glossary of Notation 417

Bibliography 427

Index 455

Preface

Graph theory is regarded as having begun with Euler's solution to the Königsberg bridge problem in 1736; Euler was possibly the most prolific mathematician of all time [**189**], (though both Paul Erdős and Serge Lang may stake a claim to this description). The historical development of infinite discrete mathematics was such that [**306**] it took another two centuries until Erdős and A. Rényi published the unique defining relation for the infinite graph. Their papers beginning in 1959 built upon the notion discovered by Erdős in the 1940s but that had lay dormant for a while, by giving a non-constructive existence proof of what became known as the random graph which we denote $\mathfrak{R}$, and by proving its uniqueness. The binomial model of the random graph due to E. N. Gilbert also dates back to 1959. Anatol Rapoport began a study of random-biased nets in [**501**], in which the emergence of a giant cluster in a certain limit is derived, though the derivation is heuristic. Rapoport introduced *biases* to provide more realistic models than can be achieved by using pure randomness. The theory is summarized in [**455**]. More on the origins of random graph theory can be found in [**323**].

In this work we focus on studying versions of the random graph with more than two adjacency types, which for clarity we denote by colours. We have devoted much attention to the countably infinite graph with three adjacency types, calling it the *triality graph*, denoting it $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ and using the symbols $\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}$ for its red, blue and green edges. Many of our results apply more generally to multicoloured generalizations of $\mathfrak{R}$ having any finite or infinite number of edge-colours.

A simple graph is a relational structure with one binary symmetric irreflexive relation. One feature which persists in the transition from simple graphs with edges and non-edges to graphs on any number of colours is the existence of a structure that is countable, universal (that is contains all finite substructures) and homogeneous (that is for which any isomorphism between finite substructures extends to an automorphism of the entire structure) [**219**] [**318**] [**400**]. Let us say a little about these two properties.

Firstly universality. Two examples of *categories*, that is structures and accompanying natural maps, leading to familiar universal objects are the collection of countable linear orders and order-preserving maps having the linear order of rationals as universal object, and countable boolean algebras together with boolean algebra isomorphisms that have the countable boolean algebra on countably many generators as universal. The universal objects may be of interest in their own right. One aim of studying a universal structure is the possibility of finding a unifying theme for the individual questions of interest as well as the chance that the universal object may have properties that influence those of the embedded substructures as well as being influenced by them. So in addition to the properties of the universal object itself, we may gather information that is useful in classifying the finite sub-objects. For the two examples just mentioned proof of universality gives us the theory of dense linear orders without endpoints and the result that a finitely generated subalgebra of a boolean algebra is finite.

Universal objects are seldom unique, because adding one point results in a different universal object, but universal homogeneous objects are unique.

There are certainly instances where universal objects fail to exist, for example for the category of countable fields and mappings preserving 0, 1, and the field operations. In graph theory, there is no countable planar graph which is universal with respect to one-to-one graph homomorphisms, nor is there a universal graph of fixed finite degree under *weak embeddings*, this being a 1–1 mapping i from the vertices of graph Γ_1 to the vertices of graph Γ_2 such that if x, y are neighbours in Γ_1 then they are also neighbours in Γ_2. The paper by Moss [**401**] contains more on the existence and nonexistence of universal graphs.

A variation on this theme is the idea of *homomorphism-universal* structures whose relationship with embedding-universal structures is given in [**297**]. Briefly, if a homomorphism is 1–1 then it is an embedding. Another example of a phenomenon where a global structure provides a description of the possible local structures of graphs is that of *limit graph* [**241**]; see Appendix 1.

Next homogeneity. To say that a structure is homogeneous is equivalent to asserting that it has the maximum amount of symmetry; or that many parts of the structure look alike; or that the structure looks the same when viewed from many positions within the structure.

We have mentioned the uniqueness of the countable random graph; it also has a huge amount of symmetry. To see how remarkable and unexpected this is, contrast the situation with the finite case. Construct

a finite random graph on n vertices by ordering the pairs of vertices in a countable sequence, and tossing a fair coin a total of $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ times where heads means join the two vertices by an edge, and tails means do nothing. Every n-vertex graph (up to isomorphism) occurs with non-zero probability, and the probability of a particular graph arising is inversely proportional to its symmetry as measured by the order of its automorphism group. The asymmetric graphs are overwhelmingly more numerous than the symmetric ones. The probability measure associated with a countable sequence of coin tosses is discussed in Appendix 3. To get a feel for the meaning of homogeneity beyond its definition consider that the pentagon or 5-cycle graph is homogeneous, but that the hexagon or 6-cycle graph is not because a pair of points two steps apart and a pair three steps apart are isomorphic as induced subgraphs but are not equivalent under automorphisms of the whole graph.

The existence and uniqueness of homogeneous universal structures follow immediately from Fraïssé's Theorem [**219**] on relational structures. As we stated, homogenous structures are those with the maximum amount of symmetry and one of the most useful methods for constructing objects with a large amount of symmetry is based on this theorem. In the two-colour case, thinking of a two-coloured complete graph as a simple graph, the appropriate structure is *Rado's graph*, or the Erdős-Rényi *random graph* [**202**] $\mathfrak{R}$; it was Richard Rado [**453**] who gave the first construction of $\mathfrak{R}$.

Fraïssé's Theory has been extended in several directions. For example, a study of relational structures which satisfy the analogue of homogeneity but for homomorphisms rather than isomorphisms was begun in [**121**]. We include some material on some of the developments in an appendix on Fraïssé's Theory of Relational Structures.

Multi-adjacency random graphs have been analysed before, as countable universal homogeneous C-coloured graphs Γ_C for $|C| \geq 2$, using permutation group theory [**527**] [**529**]. In another appendix we précis some of the results from previous research work.

The random graph is unique up to isomorphism and random graphs with different numbers of colours will be pairwise non-isomorphic. Allowing colours on vertices yields different graphs and in Chapter 2 we comment briefly on random graphs with two-coloured vertices.

Much of the impetus for the renaissance of discrete mathematics beginning in the second half of last century has been finite or finitary in origin and often guided by real-world problems. This does not diminish

the contribution of questions that are infinite in their nature. An apposite quote is the first sentence of the relevant chapter in the book [**54**]: "Although the theory of random graphs is one of the youngest branches of graph theory, in importance it is second to none." The two-coloured random graph has been studied using combinatorial [**45**], probabilistic [**55**], logical [**502**] and spectral techniques. The study of random graphs on any number of colours greater than two adds further scope to the field.

Most of the work in random graph theory so far has blended probability theory, combinatorics and logic, but our focus has been on graph constructions and group actions on the graphs. A group action can uncover some of the detailed structure and properties of an operand by seeing what actions it supports, and at the same time it can illuminate the characteristics of the acting group by giving some of its representations. This is particularly the case if a mathematical object can be uniquely determined by the algebra of functions that it can support.

In studying the infinite counterpart of a finite structure, it is natural to let one of the parameters go to infinity. This

Taking the infinite limit of a parameter of in a finite structure cannot be done arbitrarily; in discrete mathematics it may cause axiom of choice problems and in continuous mathematics, convergence issues may arise. Another reason is that certain properties may be lost in taking the limit. For example, the linear group $GL(V)$ acting on the countably infinite vector space $V = (\aleph_0, K)$ over a finite field K is *oligomorphic* (meaning that the number of $GL(V)$ orbits on the set of n-subsets of $V = (\aleph_0, K)$ is finite for all n); the field must be finite, because fixing a vector fixes all scalar multiples of it, but an infinite field gives an infinite number of scalar multiples, contradicting oligomorphicity. However oligomorphicity is *not* lost when the dimension of the space goes from finite to infinite. In fact if K is finite then $V = (\aleph_0, K)$ is totally categorical (these are the best behaved of the four classes in the categoricity spectrum implied by Morley's theorem in *model theory*), whilst it is uncountably categorical if K is countably infinite. (A set of sentences in a model is *categorical in power* λ (an infinite cardinal) if any two models of the set of cardinality λ are isomorphic.) Morley showed that a set of sentences over a countable language which is categorical in some uncountable power is categorical in all; Shelah extended the notion from first-order to infinitary logic, where the Compactness Theorem fails [**25**]. These are all notions from logic and in particular model theory, and we defer discussions these concepts to the appendices.

The word *oligomorphic* is intended to capture the notion of 'few shapes', where the group orbits contain a finite number of structures of any given finite size (that is, few) and each orbit contains an isomorphism class of structures (that is, shapes).

One systematic way to go from the finite to the infinite is using the model theory of relational structures developed by Roland Fraïssé [**220**]. This theory is widely-applicable to many different types of structures, but Fraïssé's main interest was in relational ones. If N is a finite substructure of any homogeneous structure M, then all automorphisms of N extend to automorphisms of M fixing N. If the converse holds then N is said to be a *finite homogeneous substructure* of M. Rose and Woodrow use the term *ultrahomogeneous structures* if every isomorphism between substructures of a smaller cardinality extends to an automorphism. In [**463**] they prove a sufficient condition for their existence as well as others on connections between such structures and *quantifier elimination (q.e.)* which defined in the appendix on model theory.

Model theory is a part of pure mathematics which is very general in its notions and formalism, and simultaneously very good at solving problems when specialised. Its methods are increasingly being used to great eefect in other areas of mathematics. The proofs of theorems of Gödel-Deligne, Chevalley-Tarski, Ax-Grothendieck, Tarski-Seidenberg, and Weil-Hrushovski which were an intersection of model-theoretic methods and techniques from other areas; see reference [**26**]. Other crossovers can be found in the work of Ax-Kochen-Ershov, Macintyre, Denef and du Sautoy. The important point is that such techniques were used before or instead of the usual methods of say field theory or algebraic geometry. There is a claim that algebraic geometry is in some sense a canonical special case of model theory, for while not everything can be reduced to algebraic geometry, the classical functions and the structures they give rise to are nice extensions of it. So there may be a generalization or a re-writing of deep parts of mathematics, for instance the geometric Langlands programme using model-theoretic language. The tools we use are largely group-theoretic, many of the ideas such as reducts and the small index property, are at heart model-theoretic. A comprehensive treatment of the field can be found in [**285**].

In Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, ZF, $\aleph_0$-*categoricity* of $\mathfrak{R}$ means that there is essentially only one countable model of set theory with symmetrised set-inclusion $\in$. $\aleph_0$-categoricity is a property of the automorphism group of a structure and implies a very high degree of symmetry. Homogeneity is an even stronger condition.

Relational structures with large automorphism groups have a high degree of symmetry; this is also implied by an orbit space with a small number of orbits of the acting automorphism group. A countable homogeneous relational structure of a given type is determined up to isomorphism by the isomorphism classes of its finite substructures. An important outcome of Fraïssé's Theorem is that determining the numbers of orbits on n-sets or n-tuples of *oligomorphic* permutation groups (those having finitely many orbits in their induced action on n-tuples for all n) is equivalent to enumerating the unlabelled or labelled objects in certain classes of finite structures characterized largely by the *amalgamation property*, which is a way of building larger structures from smaller ones (see Appendix 4). Not all graph classes amalgamate; for example, n-colourable graphs (those having chromatic number at most n) do not have the amalgamation property.

The model-theoretic equivalent of the concept of oligomorphic permutation group is given by the Engeler–Ryll-Nardzewski–Svenonius Theorem [**197**] [**468**] [**509**] which states that a countable (first-order) structure is axiomatisable (that is characterised up to isomorphism as a countable structure by first-order sentences) if and only if its automorphism group is oligomorphic. The surprising conclusion of this theorem is that *axiomatisability is equivalent to symmetry*. This result appears to be an *exception*. We know of no other such equivalences in model theory; it does not apply to higher cardinalities. Remarkable though the theorem is, it adds nothing to our knowledge of finite structures, for every finite permutation group is oligomorphic, and every finite first-order structure is categorical. Indeed, if the automorphism group of the n-element structure M has a base of size k, then every point of M is uniquely identified by a formula having the elements of the base as parameters. (If G is a permutation group on a set Ω, a *base* for G is a list B of elements of Ω whose pointwise stabilizer in G is the identity. One philosophy is that a list of points of the structure M which is a base for the automorphism group of M should be in some sense a base for M; this holds for first-order structures. That is, if we cannot move x to y by an automorphism fixing B pointwise, this is because the structures of $(M, [B, x])$ and $(M, [B, y])$ are different. For more on bases, see [**22**] and [**94**].)

The occurrence of the random graph paradigm in various areas of mathematics is well-known [**103**], and perhaps less famously in models in physics, see for example [**15**] [**147**] [**215**] [**458**]. What is typically being asked for is the form of 'most' graphs in families with certain properties. This is the essence of the so-called probabilistic method [**12**]. The underlying principle of random graph theory can in a heuristic way

be considered to be diametrically opposite to the principle underlying chaos theory, where neighbouring trajectories diverge exponentially for long-term behaviour, that is on an attractor.

The random graph construction has been extended to more general first-order relational structures [**186**]. It can also be viewed as a special case of the Borel-Cantelli lemmas concerning infinite sequences of trials, for example Bernoulli trials [**212**]; see Appendix 3. That such constructions can arise both via Borel-Cantelli or from a Kolmogorov zero-one law, points to the significance of probability in proofs of existence, uniqueness as well as in building mathematical structures. In fact it can be shown [**186**] that if a class of countable relational structures contains an infinite $\aleph_0$-categorical universal homogeneous structure M, then M can be constructed probabilistically. A wide range of systems that arise as complex networks have been realized as random graphs [**7**]. Many random graph properties have no unique vertex-independent threshold, but rather one that depends on the system size, with critical probability obeying $p_0(n \to \infty) \to 0$. We can think of a random graph *evolution* or *emergence* as the graph develops from a starting set of isolated vertices by the addition of random edges, that is as a changing dynamical network. The alternative passive approach, to which we have tacitly adhered, is to view random graphs as a family of graphs to which is added a probability distribution, thus turning it into a probability space.

As the graphs grow they can undergo a phase transition which for example leads from small components to a giant component [**503**]. Threshold phenomena are neither peculiar to a particular definition of randomness nor to graphs, occurring in a variety of random combinatorial structures in the limit of large size. The existence of a limit as the number of parts or interacting units in the system becomes very large is however crucial to the possibility of a sudden change in a certain property as a function of smooth changes of a parameter [**150**]. Whilst our theory is not an application of threshold effects, we do also utilize the idea of the large system limit, as we will see.

Random graph theory offers the opportunity to work along both the finite-infinite and the discrete-continuous boundaries of mathematics. Examples of this symbiosis abound, for example the exciting work on 'continuous graphs' [**14**] [**67**] [**171**] [**364**] [**429**].

After concepts such as function and space, the concept of *group* is one of the most ubiquitous ideas in mathematics and permeates almost all branches, often in a fundamental way. We have concentrated our efforts on studying the types of groups whose action is supported by

random graphs, including the random graph *reducts* (or closed supergroups of the automorphism groups) and their multicoloured variants, which we felt was a good starting point from which to uncover symmetry properties of the graphs. Closure as the automorphism group of some first-order structure is equivalent to closure in the topology of pointwise convergence [**103**].

Switching of undirected graphs was introduced by Van Lint and Seidel [**535**] in their study of a problem concerning equilateral n-tuples of points in elliptic geometry.

According to a theorem of Simon Thomas [**518**] the group of switching automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$ is one of its three non-trivial reducts, a fact that can be explained by use of the *two-graph* $\mathcal{T}(\mathfrak{R})$, a relational structure derived from $\mathfrak{R}$ whose automorphism group is $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$, the group of switching automorphisms. The extra scope gained by consideration of more than two adjacencies offers new possibilities. In the three-coloured case the equivalent group of switching automorphisms is not a reduct, for it is highly transitive but not the symmetric group; a group is *highly transitive* if it acts on an infinite set and is k-transitive, meaning that it maps any k-tuple to any other k-tuple for all integers $k \geq 1$. However there are switching automorphism reducts for multi-coloured random graphs, which together with duality-type reducts are classified in the Ph.D. thesis of James H. Bennett [**36**].

Some of the new results provide evidence that the random two-coloured graph has different switching properties to the random graph on three or more colours; broadly, the former has structure which appears to be diluted when more than two colours are considered. So the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ appears to have contrasting symmetry properties to those of the higher-adjacency graphs, as witnessed in the results of several of the chapters. This phenomenon where the low dimensional cases of a theory are seen to exhibit special behaviour which is lost in higher dimensions arises all over mathematics. We tabulate some of the differences between the two-colour and m-colour ($m > 3$) properties in an appendix. It would be worth investigating whether or not this difference extends to a loss of the 'strange logic' [**502**] that arises for $\mathfrak{R}$, in particular the phase transition in $\mathfrak{R}$ whereby over a short range, events quickly turn from being almost certainly false to almost certainly true.

J. K. Truss has studied countable universal edge-coloured graphs, and we list some of his results, leaving a more complete summary for Appendix 8. In [**527**] he proved that these graphs have simple automorphism groups. More concretely a certain subset Σ of elements of

these groups is defined such that: (a) If $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \neq 1$ then there is a conjugate τ of σ_1 such that $\sigma_2\tau \in \Sigma$, (b) if $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3 \in \Sigma$ there are conjugates τ_1, τ_2, τ_3 of $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ respectively such that $\tau_3\tau_2\tau_1 = 1$. From (a) and (b) it follows that if σ,$\tau \neq 1$, then τ is the product of five conjugates of σ. The result is proved by approximating the desired conjugacies by means of carefully chosen finite approximations.

The cycle types of elements of the automorphism groups $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ are also classified. Elements with cycle types ∞^1, ∞^2 and p^∞ for prime p are classified up to conjugacy. Finally a study is made of the relations between the groups $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, for different m.

Truss looked at the highly transitive overgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, the *group of almost automorphisms* $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$, in [**529**]. A permutation of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ is said to be an almost automorphism if the set of edges whose colour it alters is finite. He proved that $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is not simple, described its normal subgroups and characterized the possible cycle types of members of $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$.

In the main text we will study and in part extend the above-mentioned properties of the random graph to its edge-coloured relatives.

This book is part research monograph, part introduction to and summary of ground already covered over decades written with the intention of drawing in audiences from elsewhere including beginning researchers. The style of writing is intended to convey that multicoloured random graphs are a peg onto which to hang a great breadth of material. Multicoloured random graphs do have distinguishable properties from the simple random graph, as listed in the Table in Figure 2 of Appendix E, and this book is just the beginning. We have pointed out those issues where the two-coloured random graph illustrates the property under discussion.

The contents of this tractate are arranged as follows. In order to maintain the flow of the main chapters, we defer to the appendices an introduction to the objects of study and elements of the theories which we apply in the main text.

Chapter 1 introduces the triality graph $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ and proves using standard arguments some fundamental properties such as homogeneity, universality, and the pigeonhole property. We end with some comments regarding triality graphs on vertices with two colours.

In §1 of Chapter 2 we define *switching groups* $S_{m,n}$ that act on the set of complete graphs with n vertices and m different adjacencies, as

well as groups of switching automorphisms and identify the interrelationship of these two types of groups. In the next two sections we define two-coloured switching, firstly for finite graphs and then for the infinite random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ stating Thomas' Theorem that classifies its reducts. After a section which lists the reducts of the triality graph, we turn our attention to random graphs with coloured vertices, commenting on (but not giving) a classification of the reducts of the *random bipartite graph* $\mathfrak{B}^v$. After a section outlining some of the known results on random graphs with forbidden substructures, we give a detailed examination of the switching group $S_{3,3}$, as motivation for the determination in Theorem 2.19 of the structure of the finite switching groups $S_{m,n}$. One section is devoted to the switching reduct for three colours. We go on to study some of the properties of $S_{m,n}$, thereby extending the work of D. G. Higman and J. J. Seidel for $m = 2$. We prove in Theorem 2.20 that for $m \geq 3$ the extended groups defined by $G^W_{m,n} := S_{m,n} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ generated by the switchings and vertex permutations are primitive in their action on the set of complete graphs with n vertices and m edge colours, whilst for $m = 2$ these extended groups are not even transitive in their action. For any coloured graph Γ the group $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ of switching automorphisms is the stabilizer of Γ in $G^W_{m,n}$, or equivalently the group of permutations g such that $\Gamma g = \Gamma\sigma$ for some switching σ. We also show, in Theorem 2.21, for $3 \leq n \leq \aleph_0$, $3 \leq m < \aleph_0$ and for a given n, that $S_{m,n}$ is a weak transitive extension of $S_{m-1,n}$. In the case of a graph with a countably infinite vertex set and a finite number of colours on edges, we show that its group of switching automorphisms is the symmetric group on the vertex set if and only if the graph is a so-called *switched c-clique* for some colour c, where this latter concept is defined. Different definitions of switched c-clique are given and the equivalence of these definitions is proved.

In Chapter 3 we investigate variations on the switching group theme by allowing the random graphs to have an infinite number of different colours, but where an element of the switching group can only change a finite number of colours and such elements therefore generate what can be called a *finitary switching group*. We prove some results characterizing profinite properties of these groups and local finiteness of related groups. We investigate switching groups that are closed in a certain topology, identifying the parity structure which the group elements preserve. This turns out to be different to the global parity-equivalence of graphs arising in Chapter 2. We end by showing the circumstances in which switching groups can form a direct limit.

Chapters 2 and 3 offer evidence that the theory of switching groups has developed somewhat from Seidel's original definition.

In the first section of Chapter 4 we outline the theory of *local switching* [**123**] together with elements of the cohomological theory of switching classes and two-graphs. In the next section we begin a formulation of the theory for multicoloured graphs, which involves working with a set of complete multicoloured graphs with a list of edge-colours, which we call an *SML graph*. We generalize the relevant closed switching group from the previous section together with the parity that it leaves invariant. After a subsection outlining some known material on trees, we derive in two appendices two presentations for the switching group $S_{m,n}$.

We should mention that there are 3 types of colour parities appearing in our work. Firstly that in Chapter 2 (in the prelude to Theorem 2.7), which is defined on 3-coloured complete graphs, where one of the colours is stabilized and the parity refers to that of the number of second-colour edges in triangles (vertex triples) on the second and third colours. Secondly, in Chapter 3 (in the prelude to Theorem 3.7), refers to a parity-presercing permutation of a list of colours on triangles in a complete m-coloured graph. Thirdly, in Chapter 4 (in the prelude to Lemma 4.4) there is also a permutation parity of list colourings on edges of multicoloured graphs, but one which generalizes the second parity in being applicable in a slightly more general graph setting.

Chapter 5 has two parts. The first deals with polynomial algebras and polynomial invariants related to random graphs. We reveal how the algebras related to the two-coloured random graph reducts differ in their structure to those related to random graphs with more colours.

The second half of the chapter is devoted to the elucidation of an isomorphism between two algebras that have quite different structures, explaining why the isomorphism works for the very simplest infinite version of the algebras for pure point sets, whilst it fails for finite algebras. We comment on the inexhaustibility of relational structures and on links between growth rates and reconstruction. In the appendix, we begin showing the isomorphism in the case of 1, 2 and 3-vertex graphs.

In Chapter 6 various aspects of random graphs as Cayley graphs are examined.

Firstly, we use the construction of $\mathfrak{R}$ as a Cayley graph to derive results concerning cyclic automorphisms and cyclic almost automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$. Square root sets of elements of a structure such as a

group are defined and a necessary and sufficient condition for a group G to act regularly on $\mathfrak{R}$ is given, this being a translation of the one-point extension property, one of the equivalent ways of defining random graphs.

We then construct $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ as a homogeneous Cayley graph for both an index 3 subgroup of the Modular group in Theorem 6.6 and the complex Leech Lattice in Theorem 6.10. More generally we construct random Cayley m-coloured graphs from lattices $\mathbb{L}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, for $d \geq 2$, identifying lattice vectors with vertices and vector pairs with edges such that the graphs are invariant under the lattice automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$. This is quite different to known links between groups, graphs and lattices, such as the Cayley graph for the free abelian group on two generators being a lattice in the plane with vertex set $\mathbb{Z}^2$, because here the graphs are random.

After a section defining so-called *groups with triality* we prove the existence of such a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$, and further prove that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ has a split extension. Groups with triality are a generalization of what we have called Cartan triality, the algebraic triality outer automorphisms of the 8-dimensional projective reduced orthogonal group.

An extended discussion lead us to conclude that any direct approach using the Cayley object method, to demonstrating a link between the two occurrences of triality, the normalizing action of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ on $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ and a Cartan-type one is likely to fail. This is because of the absence of a fixed-point-free group action which we would require for an unambiguous graph construction. We do make some progress in the steps required to demonstrate such a connection. For example, in Theorem 6.27 we give a construction of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ via a Moufang loop, whose *multiplication group* is a group with triality. The Cartan-like triality $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$ acts as outer automorphisms of $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$.

Chapter 7 begins by defining outer automorphism groups for random graphs and then proving a theorem showing that if m is odd, an extension of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ splits over this group, that is there is a *complement*. In the case that m is even but not divisible by 8, then there is a subgroup H of the extension which is a *supplement* such that $|\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \cap H| = 2$. The formalism introduced by Alperin, Covington and Macpherson for sets [**13**] is then applied to graphs, and this leads to the definition of two new types of groups, the group of near symmetries and the group of equivalence classes of near-automorphisms for the random graph. Two further new groups are identified, the zero

vertex index group and the finite vertex index group. Maps of various types between these groups and known variations of random graph automorphism groups are indicated.

In Chapter 8 we initiate a study of neighbourhood filters on sets of random graph vertices identifying some new topologies and groups whose basic features we outline. After a motivating discussion of Sierpiński's Theorem characterizing spaces homeomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}$ we study various topologies on random graphs. A Hasse diagram of the novel groups that arise in this and the previous chapter is given.

An account of the Stone–Čech compactification of a topological space is given for neighbourhood filters on graphs.

There is a section which introduces the $\mathfrak{R}$-uniform Hypergraph $\mathfrak{RHyp}$ of Claude Laflamme, Norbert Sauer and Maurice Pouzet and Robert Woodrow defined on the vertex set of $\mathfrak{R}$ whose edges are those sets of vertices which induce a copy of $\mathfrak{R}$. Groups related to this hypergraph are related to the groups that have arisen in this and the previous chapter.

The unifying theme of Chapter 9 is various aspects of the interaction of homomorphisms and graphs, in both a finite and an infinite context. Theories of algebraic structures, such as monoids, are very wide-ranging, so we focus on special classes of such structures.

We give results on endomorphisms on graphs in general and the random graph in particular, as well as the monoids they generate. Monoids have a more amorphous structure than groups, for example lacking the equivalent of Lagrange's Theorem which even exists [**257**] [**268**] for Moufang loops (a finite Moufang loop $(Q, \cdot)$ has the Lagrange property if for each subloop L of Q, $|L|$ divides $|Q|$). As another example of the group-like properties of Moufang loops, which loops in general surely cannot be expected to obey, is the analog of the first Sylow theorem giving a criterion for the existence of a p-Sylow subloop of a finite Moufang loop, due to Grishkov and Zavarnitsine [**259**]. Finally we mention Glauberman's Z^*-theorem [**243**], through which he was able to prove version of the Feit-Thompson Theorem, that is that Moufang loops of odd order are solvable [**244**]. For more on this aspect of Moufang loops, including the connection between Moufang loops and groups with triality, see section 4 of [**267**].

Various relationships are studied between the *core* of a finite graph Γ, which is the smallest graph which is homomorphically equivalent to Γ, and a concept which is in some sense dual to the core, that is the *hull* of a graph Γ, which is a graph containing Γ as a spanning

subgraph, admitting all the endomorphisms of Γ, and having as core a complete graph of the same order as the core of Γ. There is a section which comments on the equivalent theory for cores of infinite graphs and which contains open questions.

The proof of a monoidal version of Fraïssé's Theorem for so-called HH structures is given. As we shall see, a countable structure is HH if and only if it satisfies the so-called *homo-extension property*, (and that a Fraïssé limit exists for its age which has the *homo-amalgamation property*, though the limit may not be unique); all these terms are explained in the chapter.

We further give an extension of the standard formalism allowing us to prove an equivalence theorem for (topological) endomorphism monoids and discuss how a weakening of the Engeler–Ryll-Nardzewski–Svenonius Theorem, may lead to a characterization of oligomorphic monoids. This discussion acts as motivation for just such a characterization given by Bodirsky and Pinsker in [**51**], which we briefly review.

Chapter 10 is on random graph constructions. We illustrate some of the promising connections between number theory and random graph theory by giving number-theoretic constructions of both $\mathfrak{R}$ and $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. The next section is an account of known similarities between universal metric spaces and $\mathfrak{R}$. This is followed by a section on homogeneous integral metric spaces, including references to previous work and the beginnings of a classification of reducts of such spaces. After a section on miscellaneous observations focussing on aspects of set theory, we end with an appendix on results obtained by working in a model of set theory in which the axiom of choice is false.

The first ten chapters have open questions interspersed amongst them, but Chapter 11 serves as a repository for a selection of further research directions which is intended to stimulate further work in this field. Some of the questions are natural outgrowths of the text whilst others are more speculative.

The three major themes of our account afforded by the generalization to multi-coloured graphs are an extension of switching groups to a much greater depth than has thus far been studied, constructions of random graphs in an array of other areas in mathematics, and the actions of a variety of new groups uncovered.

We have concentrated on (i) developing the theory of switching groups, their relatives and other groups supported by random graphs, (ii) constructing Cayley graphs of multicoloured random graphs and (iii) finding links between random graphs and other algebraic objects,

in particular lattices, these being at the opposite extremes as ordered structures.

For the readers' convenience and for clarity of exposition we have taken a pedestrian approach to some of the sections, recalling readily available theory before derivation of a result. This style is intended to make the material more easily digestible than if it were written down simply as theorem, proof, theorem, proof, ...; it also helps to place a result in some context, given the episodic nature of the work. Interesting comments on proof in mathematics can be found in [**521**].

The problems we have attacked represent our independent research program that is set in a wider context of pushing the random graph concept into new and uncharted territory, and in some chapters with a concentration on ideas rather than results.

There is a sense in which this work uses as its template the article "Oligomorphic Groups and Homogeneous Graphs" [**103**] by P.J. Cameron, in which there is a cross-fertilisation of random graph theory with other parts of mathematics. It has guided the philosophy of the approach of this research program. Furthermore, it has been over 20 years since the publication of the exposition "Oligomorphic Permutation Groups", which represented another key thesis in the subject, and our work is in a sense an extension of this book. It has not been our aim to extend every topic that arose in the aforementioned paper and book, but only certain aspects. Our pedagogic style is in keeping with its parent [**103**] having been a summer study school lecture course that included new results; this approach has been taken with a view to making the work more accessible to beginning researchers and those new to the field. Hence approximately one third of the main text comprises background material that serves as an introduction to the theories that are used to produce the new results, giving the treatise the maximum breadth of readership, from beginning research students to experts. Few of the new results have been published elsewhere.

We anticipate that the project will help towards an increased understanding of lively and rich areas of mathematics. It is part of the effort to find relationships between graph theory and other fields; its multidisciplinarity should appeal to a wide range of tastes. We address specific problems whose solution were feasible, but also provide more speculative longer term goals both to indicate the wide range of possible directions and because we it is not possible to know a priori the progress that will be made along a particular path. There is current interest in using graph-theoretic tools in physics and we would in particular hope that symmetry properties of random graphs find some uses there.

Another way to view this work is as an application of the probabilistic method. Many of our results exemplify different aspects of (infinite) permutation group theory. It was not possible to cover every conceivable topic; we have made little or no mention of cycle index theory, linear, circular and treelike-objects that arise as operands of oligomorphic groups, nor dynamics on random graphs. We refer to [**326**] and [**190**] for work on the last of these. Furthermore there are interpretations of random graph growth which may broadly be viewed as dynamic [**12**, p. 155] and which would be interesting to develop in future studies.

If there is one theme underlying the work as a whole, it maybe the concept of *exceptionality*. From the uniqueness of $\mathfrak{R}$ viewed as a (Bernoulli probabilistic, or Borel) measure [**429**] on a space of countable graphs, and its properties that are not shared by coloured random graphs on more than two edge-colours, to the isomorphism of Cameron and Glynn algebras in the infinite case alone, to the connection of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ with Cartan triality which we hope will be realised in the future, to the extension of the apparently unique Engeler–Ryll-Nardzewski–Svenonius Theorem [**197**] [**468**] [**509**].

Of course, not all possible generalizations are fruitful, witness for example the theory of higher-adjacency tournaments. Nevertheless, the opportunities afforded the researcher for further work in all manner of new directions are limitless. The overarching vision is that the 'random graph' signify a mathematical method for solving problems rather than an object in discrete mathematics.

Finally, in trying to cover so many aspects of a field, we have inevitably omitted a great many references that would be worthy of mention. Regrettably, it is not possible to be totally comprehensive in surveying such a broad panorama as we have attempted to do.

This book is an account of joint work with Peter Cameron.

"we require different colours, the [edges] belonging to any one substitution [i.e. generator] being of the same colour."

Arthur Cayley describing [**134**] Cayley graphs on two or more generators, as quoted in [**390**]

CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Basic Properties of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$

Mathematics studies material things not as they are but as abstracted from, though always existing in, matter .... As for logic, they do not count it among the sciences, but rather as an instrument to science. Indeed it has been said: One cannot properly study or teach except by means of the art of logic; for it is an instrument, and an instrument of something is not a part thereof.

Moses Maimonedes, *Treatise on Logic c.1152*

There are also many subjects of speculation, which, though not preparing the way for metaphysics, help to train the reasoning power, enabling it to understand the nature of a proof, and to test truth by characteristics essential to it .... Consequently he who wishes to attain human perfection, must therefore first study Logic, next the various branches of Mathematics in their proper order, then Physics, and lastly Metaphysics.

Moses Maimonedes, *The Guide for the Perplexed c.1190*

Randomness is the true foundation of mathematics.

Gregory Chaitin.

In the first section we restrict ourselves to the three-coloured random graph $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, however all the properties derived or mentioned are equally valid for the m-coloured random graphs denoted $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$, where $m > 3$. The core background is relegated to Appendix 5, and a more detailed account can found in [**103**].

The *random graph* $\mathfrak{R}$ is the unique countably infinite graph whose defining relation satisfies the $(*)$-condition:

$(*)$ If U and V are finite disjoint sets of vertices of $\mathfrak{R}$, then there exists in $\mathfrak{R}$ a vertex z joined to every vertex in U and to no vertex in V.

We will return to the proof of this assertion later.

The two adjacency types here are edge and non-edge, but this can readily be generalized to any number. For example, if we choose three

symmetric binary relations with any pair of vertices satisfying exactly one, they can more conveniently be thought of as colours, red, blue and green $(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ thereby giving the *triality graph* $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. The modified *I-property* (so-called because it is a form of injectivity) defining $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is:

$(*_t)$ If U, V and W are finite disjoint sets of vertices of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, then there exist in $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, a vertex z, joined to every vertex in U with a red edge, to every vertex in V with a blue edge, and joined to every vertex in W with a green edge.

The subscript t and superscript $\mathfrak{t}$ stand for three or triality. The property $(*_t)$ is equivalent to the satisfaction of an infinite number of first-order sentences, so is a property of the first-order theory of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$.

To demonstrate that such a graph exists, we simply modify Rado's construction of $\mathfrak{R}$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, assuming $x < y$ (so that we can get an asymmetric joining rule for an undirected graph), express y as a base 3 expansion. Join x to y respectively with a red, blue or green edge according to whether y has $2, 1$ or 0 in position x. Take 3 finite disjoint sets $U, V, W \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, and assume by adding new elements to U and V if necessary that $\max(U) > \max(V) > \max(W)$. Then the uniquely defined natural number $\sum_{u\in U} 2.3^u + \sum_{v\in V} 3^v$ can be chosen to represent z.

A countable first-order structure M is $\aleph_0$-*categorical* or equivalently *countably categorical* if any countable structure N over the same language which satisfies the same first-order sentences is isomorphic to M.

We can prove that $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is $\aleph_0$-*categorical* by using the *back-and-forth method*.

1.1. Theorem. *Any two triality graphs with a countable infinity of vertices having property $(*_t)$ are isomorphic.*

Proof. Let

$$\Gamma_1 = (a_1, a_2, \ldots) \text{ and } \Gamma_2 = (b_1, b_2, \ldots)$$

be two such graphs with vertices enumerated. The $(*_t)$ condition applies to both Γ_1 and Γ_2. If T is any graph satisfying condition $(*_t)$ we can show that the following one-point extension property holds:

$(\dagger)$ If $A \subset B$ are finite 3-coloured graphs S, with $|B| = |A| + 1$, then every embedding of A into graph T can be extended to an embedding of B into T.

Let x be the vertex in B and not in A, and f the embedding of A into T. Let U, V, W be the sets of vertices in A joined to x by red, blue and green edges respectively. Applying the definition with $U_1 = f(U), V_1 = f(V), W_1 = f(W)$, we find a vertex $z \in T$ satisfying

the conditions of the definition of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. Then extend f to B by setting $f(x) = z$. This shows that f can be extended so that its domain is all of B, proving (†).

Let A_i be a finite set of vertices of Γ_i $(i = 1, 2)$, and let

$$\Theta : A_1 \xrightarrow{\cong} A_2$$

.

Begin the back-and-forth argument with the empty isomorphism, Θ_0. At the odd-numbered stage n, let z_1 be the first vertex after the enumeration of $A_{n-1} \subset \Gamma_1$ such that $z_1 \notin \mathrm{dom}(\Theta_{n-1})$. Then by (†), there exists Θ_n, which is an extension of Θ_{n-1}, with domain $A_{n-1} \cup z_1$.

At even-numbered stage n, let z_2 be the first vertex in the enumeration of Γ_2 such that $z_2 \notin \mathrm{dom}(\Theta_{n-1}^{-1})$. Then by applying (†) in Γ_1, there exists Θ_n^{-1}, with $z_2 \in \mathrm{dom}(\Theta_n^{-1})$.

Finally, the required isomorphism that has every vertex in Γ_1 in its domain and every vertex in Γ_2 in its range is the union of the partial isomorphisms:

$$\Theta = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \Theta_n$$

where

$$\Gamma_1 \xrightarrow{\cong} \Gamma_2 \ .$$

□

An induced subgraph is obtained by omitting some of the vertices of a graph and naturally the adjacencies on those vertices. Embeddings of graphs that arise for us are always as induced substructures.

The back-and-forth method shows that any two countable triality graphs are isomorphic. Apart from uniqueness, it can be used to prove homogeneity and universality, as per the next two results.

1.2. Theorem. *$\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is homogeneous, that is any isomorphism between finite subgraphs of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ can be extended to an automorphism of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$.*

Proof. Starting with any isomorphism between finite substructures of Γ_1, instead of the empty isomorphism, and setting $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2$ gives, via the back-and-forth method, an automorphism of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. □

For structures such as $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, with only finitely many n-element substructures up to isomorphism, homogeneity is a stronger concept than countable categoricity, (though this is no longer necessarily true if there are infinitely many such substructures). The homogeneity of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ immediately implies that the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ is transitive on both edges of

a particular colour and on finite subgraphs of any given isomorphism type.

1.3. THEOREM. *$\mathfrak{R}^t$ is universal, that is any finite or countably infinite 3-edge-coloured complete graph can be embedded as an induced subgraph of $\mathfrak{R}^t$.*

PROOF. Let Γ be a finite or countable graph, with vertices denoted by $v_1, v_2, \ldots$ We can inductively embed the n-vertex subgraph $\Gamma_n = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ into $\mathfrak{R}^t$, using $(\dagger)$ to extend the embedding of Γ_n to Γ_{n+1}. Repeating this process we can embed the whole of Γ. □

Denote the random graph on m colours and a countable infinity of vertices by $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$; when $m = 3$ then $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ is simply $\mathfrak{R}^t$.

Note that $\mathfrak{R}_{2,\omega}$ is simply that graph $\mathfrak{R}$ that we began with, and the proofs of uniqueness, homogeneity and universality and the explicit construction are almost exactly the same as those we gave for $\mathfrak{R}^t$. Going colourblind in two of the three colours of $\mathfrak{R}^t$ gives a graph that is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ and whose complement in $\mathfrak{R}^t$ is also isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$.

The *pigeonhole property* for any relational structure states that for every partition of the point set of the structure into two nonempty parts, the substructure induced on one of the parts is isomorphic to the original structure. For graphs, the point set would be its vertex set.

1.4. THEOREM. *A countable 3 edge-coloured graph in which all three colours occur has the pigeonhole property if and only if it satisfies $(*_t)$.*

PROOF. We use the same method as that used in the corresponding proof for the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ to be found in [**103**].

Let Γ_1, Γ_2 be a partition of the vertex set Γ and suppose neither satisfies $(*_t)$. So for $i = 1, 2$, there are disjoint finite subsets U_i, V_i, W_i of Γ_i for which there does not exist a vertex $z_i \in \Gamma_i$ satisfying $(*_t)$. Then $U = U_1 \cup U_2, V = V_1 \cup V_2, W = W_1 \cup W_2$ also fail $(*_t)$ in the whole graph Γ.

Conversely suppose Γ has the pigeonhole property and partition Γ as $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ where Γ_1 consists of all vertices lying on no green edge. Then Γ_1 has red and blue edges only and every vertex of Γ_2 lies on a green edge within Γ_2. By assumption $\Gamma \not\cong \Gamma_1$. So $\Gamma \cong \Gamma_2$, and thus every vertex lies on a green edge. Similarly for the other two colours.

Suppose, for a contradiction, that Γ does not satisfy $(*_t)$, and let U, V, W be finite disjoint sets of vertices for which no z witnesses $(*_t)$, and choose $|S| := |U| + |V| + |W|$ minimal subject to this. If $|S| = 1$ and $S = \{x\}$ with $|U| = 1, V = \varnothing = W$, then no vertex can be joined to x by

a red edge. Similarly for the other two colours. So $|S| \geq 2$. Without loss of generality $U \neq \varnothing$.

Choose $u \in U$. Let A consist of u and those vertices in $\Gamma \backslash (V \cup W)$ that are joined to it by blue and green edges. Let B consist of the remaining vertices. Then u is red-isolated in A, so this subgraph cannot be isomorphic to Γ. By the pigeonhole property the induced subgraph on B is isomorphic to Γ. Therefore by the inductive hypothesis, that is by the minimality of $|S|$, B has a vertex z joined by a red edge to every vertex in $U \backslash \{u\}$, by a blue edge to every vertex in V and by a green edge to every vertex in W. But by construction of B, z is also joined by a red edge to u. So (U, V, W) was not after all a counterexample to $(*_t)$. □

We mention two relevant studies of partition properties of random graphs. The first is an investigation of partition properties of edge-coloured random graphs by Pouzet and Sauer [**441**]. The second is concerned with colouring subgraphs of the Rado graph; here Sauer shows [**471**] that given a universal binary countable homogeneous structure $\mathcal{M}$ and $n \in \omega$, there is a partition of the induced n-element substructures of $\mathcal{M}$ into finitely many classes so that for any partition $C_0, \ldots, C_{m-1}$ of such a class Q into finitely many parts there is a number $k \in m$ and a copy $\mathcal{M}^*$ of $\mathcal{M}$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that all of the induced n-element substructures of $\mathcal{M}^*$ which are in Q are also in C_k. We refer to Sauer's paper for a precise definition of universal in this context. Furthermore, the partition of the induced n-element substructures of $\mathcal{M}$ is given explicitly.

A modification of the non-constructive existence proof of Erdős and Rényi for $\mathfrak{R}$ gives $\mathfrak{R}^t$ as follows. Decide independently with probability $\frac{1}{3}$, whether or not to join a pair of vertices with an edge of colour $\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}$ or $\mathfrak{g}$. There are countably many different choices for the triple (U, V, W) in a graph Γ. The probability $p(z_1, \ldots, z_i)$ that $z_1, \ldots, z_i, \in \Gamma \setminus (U, V, W)$ are not correctly joined as $i \to \infty$ is

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3^s}\right)^i = 0,$$

where $s = |S| = |U| \cup |V| \cup |W|$. This leads us to the fact that $(*_t)$ holds with probability one, because the countable union of null sets is null. Since a set with probability 1 is certainly non-empty, this demonstrates non-constructively that $\mathfrak{R}^t$ exists.

We emphasize that $\aleph_0$-categoricity is a weaker concept than homogeneity over a finite relational language for the latter implies the former, but not the other way round, as evidenced by the following

three examples. Firstly, an infinite-dimensional vector space over a finite field cannot be made homogeneous over a finite relational language by adding relation symbols [**379**]. Secondly, two countable structures with the same *age* (which is the class of all finite substructures – see Appendix 4) are isomorphic if they are homogeneous but not if they are $\aleph_0$-categorical. In fact, Droste and Macpherson [**187**] constructed $2^{\aleph_0}$ non-isomorphic countable $\aleph_0$-categorical graphs, each of whose age being the class of all finite graphs, and further show that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there are continuously many countable $\aleph_0$-categorical universal graphs which are k-homogeneous but not $(k+1)$-homogeneous (see Appendix 1). Thirdly, Philip Hall's countable universal homogeneous locally finite group (see Chapter 11), which however is not $\aleph_0$-categorical because it is not of finite exponent, and so has infinitely many 1-types [**325**, p.56]; this group is the Fraïssé limit (see Appendix 4) of a suitable class of finite groups.

Triality Graphs with Coloured Vertices

For the most part in this work we will assume that we have only one type of vertex, but to end this chapter let us assume that there are two types of vertices, cyan and yellow $(\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{y})$. Our comments can be readily generalized to graphs with more than two vertex colours and more than three edge colours.

So we can define a slightly more general graph denoted $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{v})}$, which allows for 3 possible edge-colours as well as two types of vertices, whose injection property states:

$(*_{t,v})$ If U, V and W are finite disjoint sets of vertices of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{v})}$, then there exist in $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{v})}$, a cyan vertex $z^{\mathfrak{c}}$ and a yellow vertex $z^{\mathfrak{y}}$ both of which are joined to every vertex in U with a red edge, to every vertex in V with a blue edge, and joined to every vertex in W with a green edge.

To demonstrate that such a graph exists, we simply modify Rado's construction of $\mathfrak{R}$, using the odd natural numbers for the cyan vertices, and the even natural numbers including zero for the yellow vertices. The edge-formation rule is as above for $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, except that the uniquely defined natural number $\sum_{u\in U} 2.3^u + \sum_{v\in V} 3^v$ can be chosen to represent $z^{\mathfrak{c}}$ if it is an odd number and $z^{\mathfrak{y}}$ if it is even. If $m > |U \cup V \cup W|$, then we add 3^m to obtain a vertex of the opposite colour, also correctly joined.

1.5. Theorem. *Any two triality graphs with a countable infinity of vertices of both cyan and yellow variety having property $(*_{t,v})$ are isomorphic.*

The proof that $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{v})}$ is $\aleph_0$-*categorical* follows that for $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, except that (a) both a cyan vertex $z^{\mathfrak{c}} \in \mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{v})}$ and a yellow vertex $z^{\mathfrak{y}} \in \mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{v})}$ must be

found to satisfy $(*_{t,v})$; (b) f is extended to B by setting $f(x) = z^{\mathfrak{c}}$ if x is cyan or $f(x) = z^{\mathfrak{y}}$ if x is yellow.

Homogeneity and universality follow as they did for $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. An immediate corollary of the homogeneity of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{v})}$ is that the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{v})})$ has two orbits, namely cyan vertices and yellow vertices, and is transitive on edges with a particular colour and with endpoints having a given number of cyan vertices.

Theorem 1.4 is false when coloured vertices are allowed because we can have a partition where one part consists entirely of cyan vertices and the other entirely of yellow vertices.

By working with a graph Γ containing both cyan vertices $(z^{\mathfrak{c}})$ and yellow vertices $(z^{\mathfrak{y}})$ in the the Erdős-Rényi construction, the probability $p(z_1^{\mathfrak{c}}, \ldots, z_i^{\mathfrak{c}}, z_1^{\mathfrak{y}}, \ldots, z_j^{\mathfrak{y}})$ that $z_1^{\mathfrak{c}}, \ldots, z_i^{\mathfrak{c}} \in \Gamma \setminus (U, V, W)$ (respectively $z_1^{\mathfrak{y}}, \ldots, z_j^{\mathfrak{y}} \in \Gamma \setminus (U, V, W)$) are not correctly joined according to $(*_{t,v})$ is

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3^s}\right)^i = 0,$$

(respectively

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3^s}\right)^j = 0),$$

where $s = |S| = |U| \cup |V| \cup |W|$; this proves the existence of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{v})}$.

CHAPTER 2

Reducts of the Random Graphs

The three Rs – "Reading, Writing and Arithmetic, the three subjects which are taught in all elementary schools and are considered an essential part of anyone's education."

D. M. Gulland and D. G. Hinde-Howell, *The Penguin Dictionary of English Idioms – Penguin Books (1988)*

The Platonists as we have seen in Kepler's case, favoured in general a trinitarian attitude in which the soul occupies an intermediary position between mind and body.

Wolfgang Pauli, *Letter to Fierz, 9 March 1948,* [**200**]

Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose

Alfonse Karr (1808-1890), *Les Guepes, Jan.1849*, (Novelist and journalist; Oxford Dictionary of Quotations),

We had to classify things in order to cope with the complexity of nature.

Robert Winston, *BBC TV Program, 1999*

In this chapter, we introduce the reducts, concentrating our efforts on the switching groups and deriving some of their properties.

1. Switchings and Switching Permutations

Let $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$ be the set of edge-coloured simple complete graphs on a fixed set of n vertices and m edge-colours and $\Gamma \in \mathcal{G}_{m,n}$ be an arbitrary element of this set.

Let c and d be distinct colours, and Y a subset of the vertex set X of the graphs in $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$. The operation $\sigma_{c,d,Y}$ consists in interchanging the colours c and d whenever they occur on an edge with just one vertex in Y, leaving all other colours unchanged. Note that

$$\sigma_{c,d,Y} = \sigma_{d,c,Y} = \sigma_{c,d,X\setminus Y}$$

and

$$\sigma_{c,d,Y}^2 = 1.$$

The *switching group* $S_{m,n}$ is the group of permutations of $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$ generated by the *switching operations*, which are defined to be the switchings on all vertex subsets of X. A *switching class* is an orbit of $S_{m,n}$ on $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$.

If g is any element of $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$, then $\sigma_{c,d,Y}^g = \sigma_{c,d,Y^g}$. So $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$ normalizes $S_{m,n}$. Note that $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$ also acts on the set $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$, and hence so does the semidirect product of these groups.

Let Γ be an element of $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$, that is, an m-coloured graph on X. The *group of switching automorphisms* $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma) = \{g \in \mathrm{Sym}(X) : \exists \sigma \in S_{m,n}, \Gamma g = \Gamma\sigma\}.$$

That is, it consists of all permutations of X whose effect on Γ can be undone by a switching.

Another way to think about this group is as follows: let $\hat{G}$ be the stabilizer of Γ (then $\Gamma = \Gamma\sigma g^{-1}$, and g undoes the effect of σ on Γ) in the semidirect product $S_{m,n} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(X)$, and $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ the image of $\hat{G}$ under the canonical projection of the semidirect product onto $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$.

A switching class is an equivalence class of graphs under switching. Note that multicoloured graphs in the same switching class have the same switching automorphism group. For suppose that $g \in \mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$, so that $\Gamma g = \Gamma\sigma$,and let ξ be any switching operation. Then $(\Gamma\xi)g = (\Gamma\xi)\xi\sigma\xi^g$; since ξ^g is again a switching operation, g is a switching automorphism of $\Gamma\xi$.

We end the section by emphasising the difference between switching groups and groups of switching automorphisms. A switching group acts on the set of all graphs with specified sets of vertices and colours. The group of switching automorphisms acts on the vertex set of *one fixed* graph on a specific number of vertices and edges.

2. Two-Coloured Switching: The Finite Case

A two-coloured complete graph can be identified with a graph on the same vertex set; we identify the two colours c and d with adjacency and nonadjacency. We write the switching operation $\sigma_{c,d,Y}$ simply as σ_Y; it involves deleting edges with one end in Y and inserting edges between pairs of non-adjacent vertices of which one lies in Y.

The theory of such switching was worked out by J. J. Seidel in the 1960s in connection with strongly regular graphs; it is sometimes referred to as "Seidel switching". See, for example, [**480**]. (A graph in which every vertex has the same degree is called a *regular graph*. A graph is *strongly regular* if it is a regular graph such that the number of vertices mutually adjacent to a pair of vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V(\Gamma)$ depends

only on whether or not $\{v_1, v_2\}$ is an edge in the graph.) We survey briefly parts of the theory relevant to our discussion.

Since $\sigma_Y \sigma_Z = \sigma_{Y \triangle Z}$, and $\sigma_Y = 1$ if and only if $Y = \varnothing$ or $Y = X$, we see that the switching group $S_{2,n}$ is elementary abelian of order 2^{n-1}, and is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}X/\{\varnothing, X\}$, where the group operation on the power set $\mathcal{P}X$ is symmetric difference $\triangle$. Moreover, this group acts semiregularly (by definition) on the set $\mathcal{G}_{2,n}$ of graphs on the vertex set X. So the number of switching classes is $2^{n(n-1)/2}/2^{n-1} = 2^{(n-1)(n-2)/2}$. This is equal to the number of orbits by simple use of the orbit stabilizer theorem.

Note that these are "labelled" switching classes; the enumeration of "unlabelled" switching classes (that is, the orbits of the semidirect product $S_{2,n} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(X)$) was obtained by Mallows and Sloane [**381**], a result to which we shall return shortly.

That switching is an equivalence relation is easily seen: (a) Reflexivity: switch with respect to the whole of set X and everything outside X, that is $\varnothing$. (b) Symmetry: switch with respect to $Y \subset X$; and then Y again to recover the original configuration. (c) Transitivity: switching with respect to $Y_1 \subset X$ then with respect to $Y_2 \subset X$ is the same as switching with respect to $Y_1 \triangle Y_2$, the symmetric difference of Y_1 and Y_2.

We need one further result about this case. Given a graph Γ on the vertex set X, we let $\mathcal{T}(\Gamma)$ denote the set of all 3-subsets of X which contain an odd number of edges of the graph Γ. The following holds [**128**]:

(a) Graphs Γ_1 and Γ_2 on the vertex set X satisfy $\mathcal{T}(\Gamma_1) = \mathcal{T}(\Gamma_2)$ if and only if they belong to the same switching class.

(b) A set $\mathcal{T}$ of 3-subsets of X is equal to $\mathcal{T}(\Gamma)$ for some graph Γ if and only if every 4-subset of X contains an even number of members of $\mathcal{T}$.

A set $\mathcal{T}$ of 3-sets satisfying the condition of (b) is called a *two-graph*. The two-graph is trivial if either the set of 3-subsets is empty or is the entire set of all 3-subsets. The terminology is due to G. Higman (unpublished); see Seidel [**481**]. Thus there is a natural bijection between two-graphs and switching classes, and the group of switching automorphisms of a graph is equal to the group of automorphisms (in the obvious sense) of the two-graph corresponding to its switching class. In particular, we see that the group of switching automorphisms of Γ cannot be more than 2-transitive unless Γ is in the switching class of the complete or null graph. The automorphism group of the two-graph can act 2-transitively on the graph vertex set, but not always.

Seidel has shown [**481**] that for n-vertex graphs, the number t_n of switching classes equals the number of two-graphs. An *Euler graph* is one in which every vertex has even degree.

2.1. THEOREM (Mallows and Sloane). *If e_n is the number of Euler graphs on n-verices, then for all n, $e_n = t_n$.*

PROOF. Identify the edge set of a graph with its characteristic function, a binary vector of length $\binom{n}{2}$. Now let V be the vector space of all such functions (with dimension $\binom{n}{2}$) and consider the subspace U spanned by the characteristic functions of the n *star graphs* S_i, where S_i has all edges from i to the vertices different from i. Then U consists of the characteristic functions of complete bipartite graphs, and has dimension $n-1$.

Now observe:

- Adding the star graph S_i to a graph (modulo 2) is equivalent to switching at vertex i. So the cosets of U in V are the switching classes of graphs.
- A graph is Euler if and only if its characteristic vector is orthogonal to all the star graphs, and hence to all graphs in U. So $U^\perp$ is the set of even graphs.

From this, the labelled version of the theorem follows: the numbers of switching classes and of even graphs are both $2^{\binom{n}{2}-(n-1)} = 2^{(n-1)(n-2)/2}$.

Now also there is a natural isomorphism between $(V/U)^*$ (the dual space of V/U) and $U^\perp$; this isomorphism respects the action of the symmetric group $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$. By Brauer's Lemma, the numbers of orbits of a finite group on a finite vector space and its dual are equal. Since the $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$-orbits on V/U and on $U^\perp$ are isomorphism classes of switching classes and of Euler graphs respectively, the numbers of these isomorphism classes are equal; so the unlabelled version of the theorem is proved. □

3. Two-Coloured Switching: The Infinite Case

In this section we consider the case of two-coloured switching on infinite graphs. The definition remains the same and we will consider just the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$.

In mathematical logic new structures are often created from old ones by taking the same underlying set and replacing one relation with another. For example we could replace a binary relation by an n-ary relation for any $n > 2$. In this way we can construct uncountably many distinct definitions for essentially the same structure. Often two structures are considered to be the same if they are defined on the

same underlying set and have the same automorphism group. A model-theoretic definition of reduct is

Definition Let M be a countable structure for a finite relational language. A *reduct* of M is a permutation group G for which there is a structure N and a relational language L such that:

1. N has the same universe as M.
2. For each relation $R \in L$, R^N is definable without parameters in M.
3. $G = \mathrm{Aut}(N)$.

Another definition which has a more group-theoretic focus is

Definition Let M be a countable structure for a finite relational language. A *reduct* of M is a permutation group $G \leq \mathrm{Sym}(M)$ such that:

1. $\mathrm{Aut}(M) \leq G$.
2. G is a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(M)$, that is, $G = \overline{G}$, where $\overline{G}$ consists of all permutations fixing the G-orbits on n-tuples for all n.

So if $\bar{g} \in \mathrm{Sym}(M)$ and for all finite $A \subset M$ there is a $g \in G$ such that $\bar{g}$ restricted to A is the same map as g restricted to A, then $\bar{g} \in G$ also.

The two definitions are equivalent for $\aleph_0$-categorical structures as is proved for example in [**36**].

The *reducts* of the m-coloured random graph are those closed subgroups G such that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \leq G \leq \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$. That there are at least three types of proper reducts for $\mathfrak{R}$ was shown in [**82**]. That these are the only ones for $\mathfrak{R}$ is Thomas' Theorem [**518**], whose proof gives the anatomy of the reducts of $\mathfrak{R}$ as those in Figure 1. The



FIGURE 1. Reducts of $\mathfrak{R}$

proper reducts in this diagram are called *duality* ($\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R})$), *switching* ($\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$) and *biggest* ($\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R})$) groups.

An *anti-automorphism* of a graph Γ is an isomorphism from Γ to the complementary graph $\overline{\Gamma}$, while a *switching anti-automorphism* is a permutation g such that $\Gamma g = \overline{\Gamma}\sigma$ for some switching σ.

We have already defined the group of switching automorphisms of a graph; that of $\mathfrak{R}$ is denoted $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$. Clearly $\mathfrak{R}$ is isomorphic to its complement $\overline{\mathfrak{R}}$. Let $\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ be the *duality group* of automorphisms and anti-automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$. The *biggest group* whose elements are switching-automorphisms and switching anti-automorphisms, is defined by $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R}) := \langle \mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R}), \mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}) \rangle$.

Thomas' Theorem (after Simon Thomas) can be stated as follows [**518**]:

2.2. Theorem (Thomas' Theorem). *There are just five reducts of the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$. These are*

(a) $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$*;*
(b) $\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R})$*;*
(c) $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$*;*
(d) $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R})$*;*
(e) *the symmetric group* $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R})$ *on the vertex set of* $\mathfrak{R}$*.*

The duality group $\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ acts 2-transitively but not 3-transitively on $\mathfrak{R}$ which follows from its definition, as does $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ because the parity of the number of edges in a 3-vertex set is invariant under switching. The group $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ acts 3-transitively but not 4-transitively.

We reproduce the outline of the proof that appears in [**102**, p. 344].

Proof. (Sketch) Recall the Erdős-Rényi $\mathfrak{R}$-construction. Choose whether or not to join each pair of vertices in a countable set S of them with an edge, each choice being made independently with probability $\frac{1}{2}$. To see that property $(*)$ (given in Appendix 5) holds with probability 1 in the random graph, firstly note that there are only countably many choices of disjoint finite sets $U, V \in S$. Enumerate the vertices outside $U \cup V$ as $z_1, z_2, \ldots \in Z$. If $s = |S| = |U \cup V|$ then the probability that no z_i is correctly joined is

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^s}\right)^i = 0.$$

The union of countably many null sets is a null set, so the construction follows.

So the set Z of vertices satisfying $(*)$ produces a graph isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$. From the homogeneity of $\mathfrak{R}$ it follows that the pointwise stabilizer

in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ of the set $U \cup V$ in $(*)$ acts homogeneously on Z, that is the induced permutation group is a dense subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(Z)$.

We call two finite graphs *equivalent* if a copy of the first in $\mathfrak{R}$ can be mapped to a copy of the second by an element of a closed supergroup G of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$. The pointwise stabilizer $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})_{(X)}$ of a finite subset $X \subset \mathfrak{R}$ has $2^{|X|}$ orbits in $\mathfrak{R}\backslash X$, each orbit Z corresponding to the subset of X consisting of vertices adjacent to that orbit. The orbits of $G_{(X)}$ are unions of these Z orbits. Of the following two cases, will discuss only (a) which applies to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ and $\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R})$, and note that (b) which applies to $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ and $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ follows by similar arguments:
(a) $\exists\ \varnothing \neq X$ and an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})_{(X)}$-orbit Z which is fixed by $G_{(X)}$;
(b) no such X and Z exist.

Now assume that G is a counterexample to the theorem. Let G be n-transitive but not $(n+1)$-transitive, and assume that n is as small as possible. It must be that $n > 1$, for if G is not 2-transitive, it must preserve the $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$-orbits on pairs, that is edges and non-edges. Choose X and Z as in case (a). By our earlier remark, the closure A^{cl} of the permutation group induced by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})_{(X)}$ on Z is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$. Now the closure G^{cl} of $G_{(X)}$ is a closed supergroup of A^{cl}. A combinatorial argument shows that G^{cl} is not n-transitive. By choice of n, G^{cl} must be isomorphic to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$, $\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R})$, $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ or $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R})$, and we can discount the latter two as we are in case (a). By enlarging X by two points of Z if necessary, we may assume that $G^{cl} \cong \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$, as no anti-automorphism can fix two points. Equivalently, if $g \in G$ induces an isomorphism on X then it induces an isomorphism on Z. A combinatorial argument then shows that $G_{(X)} \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$, that is if $g \in G$ induces an isomorphism on X then $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

We must now show that for every $g \in G$ there is a subgraph of $\mathfrak{R}$ isomorphic to X on which g induces an isomorphism or an anti-isomorphism. This uses a Ramsey-type theorem of Deuber [**167**] and Nešetřil and Rödl [**411**]: for every finite graph U there is a finite graph V with the property that for any 2-colouring of the edges of V there is a monochromatic induced subgraph isomorphic to U. By iterating we get a graph W such that given 2-colourings of both its edges and non-edges, there is an induced subgraph isomorphic to U in which both its edges and non-edges are monochromatic. Apply the theorem with U as the union of the X constructed above, a graph not equivalent to a complete graph, and a graph not equivalent to a null graph. Let W be chosen thus, and assume that W is embedded in $\mathfrak{R}$. Give edge e of W colour c_1 if eg is an edge and colour c_2 if eg is a non-edge; and 2-colour the non-edges of W similarly. We find a copy of U in $\mathfrak{R}$ for which both

edges and non-edges are monochromatic, that is Ug is complete or null or isomorphic to U or its complement. If we chose U so that Ug cannot be complete or null then g induces an isomorphism or anti-isomorphism on U (and hence on X), and the theorem is proved. □

4. Three-Coloured Reducts

That the random graph is isomorphic to its complement is due to the duality between edges and non-edges. Similarly there is a triality between the types of edges in $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$.

An automorphism of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is by definition an adjacency-preserving permutation of its vertex set – that is, $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ is a permutation if for each type (or colour) of edge $\{x, y\}$, the edge $\{gx, gy\}$ is of the same type; so $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ stabilizes the colour classes. Let $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ be the group of permutations of the vertex set which preserves the partition of the edge set into the three colour classes. The group $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ has $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ as a normal subgroup, such that if $T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ is the triality group (which is just $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$) acting on the colours then $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) \triangleleft \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ and

$$\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})/\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) \cong T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(3).$$

This is because $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ is the kernel of the action on colours; the quotient is $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ because permuting the colours gives a graph isomorphic to the original one. The quotient is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$ because the group of permutations of the colours has precisely the structure of $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$. This triality property of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is equivalent to the duality property of the random graph whereby $\mathfrak{R}$ is isomorphic to its complement.

An automorphism of a graph gives orbits of different colours of edges. In Chapter 7 we will more accurately identify this as an *inner* automorphism, for clearly the cosets of $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ relative to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ form outer automorphisms, a precise definition of which is given in this chapter.

Notice that $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ is 2-transitive on vertices; for let α and β be red-adjacent vertices of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. By homogeneity these can be mapped to any other vertex pair joined by a red edge. If γ and δ are any vertex pair joined by a blue edge, then a triality mapping $\mathfrak{r}$ to some $\mathfrak{b}$ in $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$, (either by stabilizing $\mathfrak{g}$ and transposing $\mathfrak{r}$ and $\mathfrak{b}$ or by a $(\mathfrak{rbg})$-cycle), takes (α, β) to some blue edge and an automorphism maps this blue edge to (γ, δ).

With Thomas' Theorem in mind we can define equivalent types of groups for m-coloured random graphs $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ on a countable infinity of vertices, as follows:

(1) The *Duality* group reducts ($\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$). For any subgroup $H \leq \mathrm{Sym}(m)$ there is a reduct of the m-coloured random graph corresponding to H, this being the group $\mathrm{DAut}^H(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ of duality automorphisms which induce an element of H on the set of colours. For the usual random graph, the duality group preserves the parity of edges in every 4-subset of $\mathfrak{R}$. We can construct such a duality-type reduct as follows. For some positive integer k take a k-ary relation R (this exists at least when $k = m-1$) on the colour-set $\{c_1, \ldots, c_m\}$ such that $\mathrm{Aut}(R) = H$. Define a $2k$-ary relation $\tilde{R}$ on vertices by

$$(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \ldots, x_k, y_k) \in \tilde{R} \Leftrightarrow (c(x_1, y_1), \ldots, c(x_k, y_k)) \in R,$$

where $c(x, y)$ denotes the colour of the edge between vertices x and y.

Also let P be a quaternary relation such that $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) \in P \Leftrightarrow c(x_1, y_1) = c(x_2, y_2)$. If a permutation g preserves P then it induces a permutation $\hat{g}$ of the colours and if g preserves $\tilde{R}$ then $\hat{g}$ preserves R so $\hat{g} \in H$. Therefore $g \in \mathrm{Aut}^H(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, which is the group of vertex-permutations that induces permutations H of colours. Conversely $\mathrm{Aut}^H(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ preserves $\tilde{R}$ and P. Therefore $\mathrm{Aut}^H(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) = \mathrm{Aut}(\tilde{R}, P)$ is a reduct. So all such duality-type groups are genuine reducts. Furthermore different groups H give different reducts. Specialising this to $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, we can immediately give in Figure 2 five of the duality-type reducts that play the role of the duality group of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ where for example $\langle(\mathfrak{bg})(\mathfrak{r})\rangle$ denotes the subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ that is generated by permutations of the vertices which induce the transposition $(\mathfrak{bg})$ on colours. This lattice is isomorphic to the subgroup lattice of $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$; so for example defining $K = \langle(\mathfrak{bg})(\mathfrak{r})\rangle$ to be the group of isomorphisms and complementations (that is $\mathfrak{bg}$ colour transpositions) of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, gives a group acting on the vertices of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, and such that $|K : \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})| = 2$.



FIGURE 2. Duality-type reducts of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$

(2) The *Switching* group reducts ($\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$). Switching a two-coloured graph with respect to a set of vertices transposes the colours of the edges between the vertex set and its complement, whilst leaving

unaltered the coloured adjacencies within and outside the chosen vertex set. For the usual random graph, the switching group preserves the parity of edges in every 3-subset of $\mathfrak{R}$. If more than two colours are considered any subgroup $H \leq \mathrm{Sym}(m)$ yields a switching group as follows. For any element $h \in H$, the h-switching with respect to a subset X of the vertex set of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is the map which permutes the colours of edges between X and its complement according to h, whilst fixing the colours of edges within or outside X. To such subgroups H, there corresponds a group of switching automorphisms which is the group of all permutations of the graph vertex set which map it to its image under some h-switching for some $h \in H$. For example in the case of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, if the orbit partition of H is of the form $\{\mathfrak{r}\}\{\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g}\}$, this gives a reduct for the closure of this group because, denoting a graph edge by (x_i, y_i), the edges satisfy the relation R for which: $\{R = (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \ldots, x_k, y_k) :$ parity of the $\mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ coloured edges is invariant under switching$\}$; for more on this see Theorem 2.6. As we will see below the partition $\{\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g}\}$ yields a duality reduct but not a switching reduct.

The $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{3,\omega})$ reducts for intransitive subgroups H of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$ are not 2-transitive, for if we stabilize the red colour say by switching only blue and green adjacencies, we would not be able to take a green or a blue edge to a red one by switching. However if $H = \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$ then the corresponding group of switching automorphisms turns out to be highly vertex transitive, as noted after the proof of Theorem 2.11 below.

(3) The *Biggest* group reducts ($\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$) are those groups generated by both the switching reducts and by those dualities that preserve the partition of the colour set. For the usual random graph, the biggest group preserves the parity of edges in every 5-subset of $\mathfrak{R}$.

The reducts of the random m-coloured graph have been classified in the Ph.D. thesis of Bennett [**36**]. For the rest of this section we report on his work, using our own notation for the reducts. He finds two types of reducts:

(i) *reducible* reducts ($G \leq \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$), for which two colours are indistinguishable, (that is we are colourblind in two colours), so that as far as the group of automorphisms is concerned there are $m-1$ distinct colours. The classification of reducible reducts thus simply becomes the classification of reducts of $\mathfrak{R}_{m-1,\omega}$, which is done by induction.

(ii) *irreducible* reducts ($\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \leq G < \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$) of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$. These are generated (as topological groups) by groups of switching automorphisms and duality automorphisms, where each group of switching automorphims $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ corresponds to an abelian subgroup A

of $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ and each $\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ corresponds to a subgroup B of the normalizer of A in $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$.

Note that the *trivial* reducts, $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ have as respective structures the original structure itself (which corresponds to taking the trivial duality and switching groups) and a vertex set with no structure at all (which is reducible since all colours are indistinguishable).

The motivation for Bennett's abelian characterization – that if $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is irreducible, then $\exists H \leq \mathrm{Sym}(m)$ corresponding to the switching group that must be abelian, is the following. The commutator of two non-commuting permutations in $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ must fail to preserve some colour c. A switching of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ can be found that stabilizes colours on all edges except a specific one which originally had colour c. Repeating this process gives a graph with no edges of colour c. Another of Bennett's theorems then implies that $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is reducible.

Now let $H, D < \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$. By the previous result, if a reduct $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \leq G < \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is irreducible then H is abelian. We can assume that $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ contains all 1-vertex switchings in G, so H contains all corresponding colour permutations. So if $\alpha \in D, \beta \in H$, but $\alpha\beta\alpha^{-1} \notin H$ then $\exists \delta \in \mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ and a single vertex switch $\sigma \in \mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ with colour permutations α and β respectively, such that $\delta\sigma\delta^{-1} \notin \mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$. So D normalizes H.

Whereas Bennett's thesis [**36**] concentrates on classifying reducts of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$, we have explored slightly more widely, looking for example at groups that are not reducts by virtue of their being highly transitive in their action on the graph vertex set; this is detailed in later sections of this chapter and in later chapters. We also look at wider classes of graphs in the next section.

To illustrate the classification given in [**36**] we find the reducts in the 3-colour case, that is the reducts of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. There is an irreducible reduct for every combination of abelian group $1 \leq A \leq \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ and their normalizers $1 \leq N(A) \leq \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$.

The following table gives the 18 irreducible reducts. The interrelationships of all 31 of the triality graph reducts that we give are illustrated in the Hasse diagram given in Figure 4. An explicit proof showing that our list of reducts of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is exhaustive remains an open question.

A	B	*Reduct*
1	1	$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
1	$(\mathfrak{bg})$	$\mathfrak{r}D(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
1	$(\mathfrak{rg})$	$\mathfrak{b}D(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
1	$(\mathfrak{rb})$	$\mathfrak{g}D(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
1	$(\mathfrak{rbg})$	$\mathrm{Alt}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$
1	$\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$	$T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
$(\mathfrak{bg})$	1	$\mathfrak{r}S(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
$(\mathfrak{bg})$	$(\mathfrak{bg})$	$\mathfrak{r}B(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
$(\mathfrak{rg})$	1	$\mathfrak{b}S(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
$(\mathfrak{rg})$	$(\mathfrak{rg})$	$\mathfrak{b}B(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
$(\mathfrak{rb})$	1	$\mathfrak{g}S(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
$(\mathfrak{rb})$	$(\mathfrak{rb})$	$\mathfrak{g}B(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
$(\mathfrak{rbg})$	1	$3\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
$(\mathfrak{rbg})$	$(\mathfrak{bg})$	$3\mathfrak{r}D(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
$(\mathfrak{rbg})$	$(\mathfrak{rg})$	$3\mathfrak{b}D(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
$(\mathfrak{rbg})$	$(\mathfrak{rb})$	$3\mathfrak{g}D(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$
$(\mathfrak{rbg})$	$(\mathfrak{rbg})$	$3\mathrm{Alt}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$
$(\mathfrak{rbg})$	$\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$	$3T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$

FIGURE 3. Irreducible reducts of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$



FIGURE 4. Reducts of $\mathfrak{R}^t$

We require an explanation of our notation for the groups in this diagram. The above groups have the following actions:-

(i) $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ is the group of all permutations of the vertices.

(ii) $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t_\mathfrak{r})$, $S(\mathfrak{R}^t_\mathfrak{r}), D(\mathfrak{R}^t_\mathfrak{r}), B(\mathfrak{R}^t_\mathfrak{r})$. These are respectively the automorphism group, the group of switching automorphisms, the group of duality automorphisms, and the biggest group of automorphisms that is generated by the switching and duality automorphisms. These act on the vertex set of the triality graph which is colourblind in colour red ($\mathfrak{r}$), that is without differentiating between red and either the green or blue. So, as only two colours are being considered, the existence of these groups follows from Thomas' Theorem [**518**]. They are what Bennett calls reducible reducts.

(iii) $\mathfrak{r}D(\mathfrak{R}^t), \mathfrak{r}S(\mathfrak{R}^t), \mathfrak{r}B(\mathfrak{R}^t)$. These groups act on the vertex set of the triality graph so as to stabilize the colour red. For example $\mathfrak{r}D(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ permutes the set of vertices with the effect of fixing red coloured edges and either fixing or interchanging blue and green edges. Similarly $\mathfrak{r}S(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ switches blue and green, whilst preserving red.

(iv) The existence of the triality group $T(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ and its index 2 subgroup $\mathrm{Alt}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$ was mentioned with at the beginning of this section. More will be said in a later chapter.

(v) $3\mathfrak{r}D(\mathfrak{R}^t)$, $3\mathfrak{b}D(\mathfrak{R}^t)$, $3\mathfrak{g}D(\mathfrak{R}^t)$, $3T(\mathfrak{R}^t)$, $3\mathrm{Alt}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$, $3\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$. These groups correspond to the colour permutations of the cyclic group H of order 3 in $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$ preceding the respective actions, rather than simply being generated by transpositions of pairs of colours. We have prefixed these groups with 3 to denote the 3-cycle action and have indicated them to be overgroups of the other duality groups by dotted lines in the diagram. The smallest one of these reducts is the H-automorphism group $3\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$. Three of the other five are the H-duality groups for three non-trivial subgroups of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$. The three indices of the form $|3\mathfrak{i}D(\mathfrak{R}^t) : \mathfrak{i}D(\mathfrak{R}^t)|$ ($\mathfrak{i} = \mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g}$) equal 2, because we can cycle in one of two directions, either $\mathfrak{r} \to \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{b} \to \mathfrak{r}$ or $\mathfrak{r} \to \mathfrak{b} \to \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{r}$. This inclusion also arises between the other pairs of such H-duality reducts and their duality subgroups.

(vi) $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ is the automorphism group stabilizing the colours.

The green and blue equivalents of the red groups in (ii) and (iii) are similarly defined and this gives us the remaining reducts in the diagram.

5. Random Graphs with Coloured Vertices

The aim of this section is to introduce simple random graphs on two different types of vertices, which we denote $\mathfrak{R}^v$ and to which we assign the colours cyan and yellow $(\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{y})$. This section is taxonomic in nature and indicates how the simple modification of adding an extra species of vertex leads to a proliferation of reducts. This can be readily generalized to graphs with more than two vertex colours. But first we briefly recall random bipartite graphs, which inevitably arise in any attempt to classify reducts of random graphs with coloured vertices.

The class of bipartite graphs is not homogeneous; for example, given two non-adjacent vertices, we do not know whether they are in the same bipartite block or not. For a further example, it is not possible to amalgamate a path of length 2 and one of length 3 with the same endpoints in the class of bipartite graphs. However the class of graphs with a prescribed bipartition does have a Fraïssé limit, this being a universal bipartite graph which is distance-transitive of diameter 3 [**106**]. This *random bipartite graph* as defined in [**103**], is the unique countable graph $\mathfrak{B}$ such that, if we take two disjoint countable sets of vertices and join pairs of vertices in different sets independently with probability $\frac{1}{2}$, the resulting graph is almost surely isomorphic to $\mathfrak{B}$. Another way to obtain this graph, is to toss a fair coin to determine in which block a vertex goes, then to join it at random to vertices in the other block; with probability 1 we get infinitely many vertices in each bipartite block. We recall some of the discussion of this object from [**103**].

We assume that there are no edges between vertices within either of the blocks. A bipartite graph cannot be made homogeneous unless it is complete bipartite or null, for two non-adjacent vertices in different blocks cannot be mapped by an automorphism to two vertices in the same block; so these pairs are not considered equivalent. A graph Γ is said to be *almost homogeneous* if there are a finite number of relations $R_1, \ldots, R_k$ such that

(i) each R_i is first-order definable (without parameters) in Γ;

(ii) the structure $(\Gamma, R_1, \ldots, R_k)$ is homogeneous.

For example the disjoint union of two copies of $\mathfrak{R}$ (having no edges between the copies) is not homogeneous, but becomes so when an extra binary relation is added to the language which is an equivalence relation whose classes are the two copies of $\mathfrak{R}$. A second example is a bipartite graph with diameter at most 3 which has a bipartition defined by the set $\{(x, y) : (\exists z)(x \sim z \sim y)\}$.

The graph $\mathfrak{B}$ is universal for finite bipartite graphs. It is also almost homogeneous, and can be made homogeneous by adding the above bipartition relation. The *I-property* for this graph is

$(*_B)$ If U and V are finite disjoint sets of vertices of $\mathfrak{B}$ in the same bipartite block, then there exists a vertex z in the opposite block of $\mathfrak{B}$ joined to every vertex in U and to no vertex in V.

Let Δ_1, Δ_2 denote the bipartite blocks of $\mathfrak{B}$, and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{B})$ its automorphism group. We will list some groups that are clearly reducts, though a proof that this list is exhaustive is left to future work. A highly transitive group (whose closure is the symmetric group) can occur as the group induced on a definable subset in a nontrivial closed group. We conjecture that this fact can be used in classifying the set of reducts of $\mathfrak{B}$, and though we will not give this classification we make the following comments:

1. $\mathfrak{B}$ is isomorphic to its bipartite complement $\mathfrak{B}^*$, obtained by interchanging edges and non-edges between Δ_1 and Δ_2. So there is a duality group $\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{B})$ containing $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{B})$ as a subgroup of index 2.

2. Define *bipartite switching* with respect to (X_1, X_2), where $X_1 \subseteq \Delta_1$ and $X_2 \subseteq \Delta_2$ as follows: exchange edges and non-edges between X_1 and $\Delta_2 \backslash X_2$, and between X_2 and $\Delta_1 \backslash X_1$, leaving the rest unaltered. This leads to the switching group $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{B})$.

3. There is a "biggest group" $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{B}) = \langle \mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{B}), \mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{B}) \rangle$, (except that in this case it is not the biggest nontrivial reduct).

4. There is a group $\mathrm{Sym}(\Delta_1) \operatorname{Wr} \mathrm{Sym}(2)$, the automorphism group of the complete bipartite graph on (Δ_1, Δ_2).

5. Finally, $\mathrm{Sym}(\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2)$.

We can retain the names for the proper reducts that were used in the case of the random graph, that is *duality* ($\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{B})$), *switching* ($\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{B})$) and *biggest* ($\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{B})$) groups

Only the uppermost symmetric group reduct in Figure 5 is primitive because all the others preserve the bipartite blocks.

Next we give Hasse diagrams of some reducts of (a) the random bipartite graph which we denote $\mathfrak{B}^v$ with one block comprising cyan vertices $\mathfrak{B}^{\mathfrak{c}}$ and the other block yellow vertices $\mathfrak{B}^{\mathfrak{y}}$, and (b) the random graph with both cyan and yellow vertices, $\mathfrak{R}^v$. All of these groups are highly transitive.

Remark A *pseudoreduct* is a permutation group that is not closed, but is closed on an enlarged vertex set. Thomas gave a definition for any countable structure [**519**]. The group induced on a bipartite block of $\mathfrak{B}$ by its stabilizer in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{B})$ is highly transitive and so not a reduct, but it is a pseudoreduct. The following groups are also pseudoreducts.



FIGURE 5. Reducts of $\mathfrak{B}$

(a) Random Bipartite Graph with vertex colours, $\mathfrak{B}^v$.

The pseudoreduct diagram is Figure 6, with the following meaning attached to the pseudoreducts:

$\mathrm{Aut}^+(\mathfrak{B}^v)$ - group of automorphisms fixing the two bipartite blocks.

$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{B})$ - group of automorphisms not necessarily fixing the two bipartite blocks, but fixing the graph as a whole.

$D^+(\mathfrak{B})$ - group of duality permutations, interchanging edges and non-edges between the two blocks.

$D(\mathfrak{B})$ - as $D^+(\mathfrak{B})$, except the permutations either fix or interchange the two blocks.

$\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{B}^\mathfrak{c}) \times \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{B}^\mathfrak{y})$ - symmetric group action independently on the two blocks.

$\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{B}^\mathfrak{c}) \,\mathrm{Wr}\, C_2 \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{B}^\mathfrak{y}) \,\mathrm{Wr}\, C_2$ - wreath product group action permuting both blocks independently of each other and together with each other.

$\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{B}^v)$ - full symmetric group.

Now define a $\mathfrak{c}$-vertex switching as follows: for a subset $A \subseteq B^\mathfrak{c}$, it interchanges edges and non-edges from A to $B^\mathfrak{y}$, and leaves all other adjacencies unchanged. Similarly for a $\mathfrak{y}$-vertex switching. Then we have that

$S^\mathfrak{c}(\mathfrak{B})$ - group of $\mathfrak{c}$-vertex switching automorphisms, which are permutations that fix blocks $B^\mathfrak{c}$ and $B^\mathfrak{y}$ and map the graph into one that is $\mathfrak{c}$-vertex switching equivalent.

$S^\mathfrak{y}(\mathfrak{B})$ - as previous group with $\mathfrak{c}$ and $\mathfrak{y}$ interchanged.

$S^{\mathfrak{c}+\mathfrak{y}}(\mathfrak{B})$ - group generated by elements from both $S^{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathfrak{B})$ and $S^{\mathfrak{y}}(\mathfrak{B})$.
$B^{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathfrak{B})$ - group generated by elements from both $S^{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathfrak{B})$ and $D(\mathfrak{B})$.
$B^{\mathfrak{y}}(\mathfrak{B})$ - group generated by elements from both $S^{\mathfrak{y}}(\mathfrak{B})$ and $D(\mathfrak{B})$.
$B(\mathfrak{B})$ - group generated by elements from both $S^{\mathfrak{c}+\mathfrak{y}}(\mathfrak{B})$ and $D(\mathfrak{B})$.

Note that switching with respect to the whole of $B^{\mathfrak{c}}$ or the whole of $B^{\mathfrak{y}}$ is complementation, which gives a pseudoreduct. However, we must demonstrate that more generally, the set of $\mathfrak{c}$-vertex switching automorphisms forms a reduct. This follows because the composition of sequential switchings about two sets of vertices is equivalent to switching about their symmetric difference; switching about the same set twice gives the identity operation. Closure in $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{B}^{\mathfrak{c}}) \times \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{B}^{\mathfrak{y}})$ follows because $S^{\mathfrak{c}}(\mathfrak{B})$ satisfies the following binary relation on vertices,

$rel := \{a_1, a_2 \in B^{\mathfrak{c}}$ and $b_1, b_2 \in B^{\mathfrak{y}}$:
the edges between these four vertices have the same parity$\}$.

Firstly any edge not in the switching set is stabilized. Any pair of edges or pair of non-edges switched together is parity-preserving, as is any switching of an edge and a non-edge pair. Similarly for $S^{\mathfrak{y}}(\mathfrak{B})$ and $S^{\mathfrak{c}+\mathfrak{y}}(\mathfrak{B})$. The wreath product action also leaves invariant a relation required for closure of the resulting wreath product of groups, the C_2 involution corresponding to independent interchange of the two blocks.



FIGURE 6. Reducts of $\mathfrak{B}^v$ - (equivalently pseudoreducts of $\mathfrak{R}^v$ (Part 1/4))

Recall some theory [**484**] of two-graph representations for two-colour graphs. Imagine an n-vertex graph $\Gamma = (V, E)$ with a $(-1, 1)$-adjacency matrix E. Switching about any vertex $v \in V$ can be effected by addition (mod 2) of the graph $K_{1,n-1}$ in v. So the switching class of Γ is the equivalence class Γ modulo $\mathcal{B}_c$, where $\mathcal{B}_c$ is the set of n-vertex complete bipartite graphs. Equivalently it is the set of graphs (V, DED), for $D \in \mathcal{D}_n$, where $\mathcal{D}_n$ is the set of $n \times n$ diagonal matrices with ± 1 diagonal entries. Equivalently still, it is the map $(V, E) \to (V, DED)$ where D has -1 in the diagonal position v and 1 otherwise.

Switching classes of simple graphs can thus be explained in terms of bipartite graphs [**484**]. The set of all graphs on a given vertex set is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-vector space, where the sum of two graphs is obtained by taking the symmetric difference of their edge sets. Complementation then corresponds to adding the complete graph, and switching to adding a complete bipartite graph.

An example of the effect of the addition of a complete graph is the following:



It follows from Thomas' Theorem that if G is a closed supergroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$, then the set of all images of $\mathfrak{R}$ under G is contained in a coset of a subspace $W(G)$ of this vector space. (For example, $W(\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R}))$ consists of all complete bipartite graphs and all unions of at most two complete graphs). These subspaces are invariant under the symmetric group.

(b) Random Graph with coloured vertices, $\mathfrak{R}^v$. This graph has a countable infinity of both $\mathfrak{c}$-vertices and $\mathfrak{y}$-vertices. The reducts can be treated as four separate cases, which also makes the reduct diagram more transparent to follow, for these four cases are mutually independent and lie between $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}^v)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^v)$ in separate sub-diagrams, which we label Parts 1 – 4.

Firstly there are reducts that correspond to the graph $\mathfrak{B}^v$, given in Figure 6 above, all lying between $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}^v)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^v)$. These permute the $\mathfrak{c}$ and $\mathfrak{y}$ vertices as though they lay in disjoint countable subgraphs.

Secondly there are reducts corresponding to indistinguishability of $\mathfrak{c}$ and $\mathfrak{y}$ vertices, which we represent by the superscript $(\mathfrak{c} \cup \mathfrak{y})$. The resulting Hasse diagram is given in Figure 7.



FIGURE 7. Reducts of $\mathfrak{R}^v$ (Part 2/4)

Thirdly there are the reducts permuting the $\mathfrak{c}$ vertices amongst themselves, and the $\mathfrak{y}$ vertices amongst themselves. For all wreath products of any reduct G, the group $G^{\mathfrak{c}} \operatorname{Wr} C_2$ is isomorphic to $G^{\mathfrak{y}} \operatorname{Wr} C_2$ as abstract groups. Also $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{B}^{\mathfrak{c}}) \times \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{B}^{\mathfrak{y}}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{c}}) \times \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{y}})$. We break down the resulting Hasse diagram into two independent parts, given on the next two pages as Figures 8 and 9, which are joined at their common groups $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}^v)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}^{\mathfrak{c}} \times \mathrm{Aut}^{\mathfrak{y}}$.

In Figure 8 we have not included all possible subgroup inclusions for reasons of space, omitting for example that $\mathrm{Aut}^{\mathfrak{c}} \times \mathrm{Aut}^{\mathfrak{y}} < D^{\mathfrak{c}} \times D^{\mathfrak{y}}$ where $|D^{\mathfrak{c}} \times D^{\mathfrak{y}} : \mathrm{Aut}^{\mathfrak{c}} \times \mathrm{Aut}^{\mathfrak{y}}| = 4$.



FIGURE 8. Reducts of $\mathfrak{X}^v$ (Part 3/4)



FIGURE 9. Reducts of $\mathfrak{R}^v$ (Part 4/4)

Clearly we would not be able to comfortably fit the reduct diagram of the triality graph with coloured vertices on one page. In principle it is possible to construct a reduct diagram for graphs on any countable number of different vertex species.

Finally in this section, we mention a model of simple, finite random graphs in which the vertices rather than the edges are the focus. In these *random intersection graphs* [**324**] [**305**], each vertex is independently assigned a random structure and the adjacency of two vertices is decided by comparing these structures.

More specifically, a graph Γ is an *intersection graph* if each vertex $v \in V(\Gamma)$ can be assigned a set S_v such that $\{v, w\} \in V(\Gamma)$ precisely when $S_v \cap S_w \neq 0$. Then Γ is the intersection graph of the family of sets $\mathcal{S} = \{S_v : v \in V(\Gamma)\}$. If furthermore, the sets from $\mathcal{S}$ are generated in a random way then Γ is a *random intersection graph*.

6. Random Graphs with Forbidden Substructures

Let K_k be the complete graph on k vertices. Finite K_k-free graphs amalgamate to satisfy Fraïssé's hypotheses, (see Appendix 4). For $k \geq 3$, a *Henson graph*, denoted $\mathfrak{H}_k$, is the unique countable homogeneous K_k-free graph which contains every finite K_k-free graph [**275**]. The relevant I-property is

($*_k$) If U and V are finite disjoint sets of vertices, such that U contains no K_{k-1}, then there is a vertex z joined to every vertex in U and to no vertex in V.

The notion of *indivisibility* for relational structures originates in Fraïssé's book [**220**]. A structure $\mathcal{M}$ is *Ramsey* for $\mathcal{N}$, if for every partition $\mathcal{M}$ into two classes C and D there is an embedding of $\mathcal{N}$ into C or an embedding of $\mathcal{N}$ into D; see Pouzet's [**438**]. A graph Γ is said to be *indivisible* if for every partition of the vertex set of Γ into two classes A and B there is an isomorphic copy of Γ either in A or in B. Folkman [**216**] studied the Ramsey-type property that graphs have monochromatic complete subgraphs in every edge colouring. El-Zahar and Sauer proved in [**194**] that every homogeneous K_k-free graph, $\mathfrak{H}_k$ ($k \geq 3$), is indivisible, whilst in [**195**] they related the divisibility or indivisibility of the age of homogeneous relational structures to the way they amalgamate. See [**220**, Chapter 6, §6] for more on this notion, and [**161**] for further applications to countable homogeneous indivisible structures.

Thomas used the same technique as that in [**518**] to prove that the reducts of the homogeneous universal K_k-free graphs $\mathfrak{H}_k$ for $2 < k < \omega$

are $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{H}_k)$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{H}_k)$. Switching or complementing a subgraph of $\mathfrak{H}_k$ may not result in another $\mathfrak{H}_k$.

The strongest known universality result about graphs with forbidden substructures is the following result of Cherlin, Shelah and Shi [**143**]:

2.3. Theorem. *For every finite set of finite connected graphs, the class of all graphs for which there is no homomorphism into any member of the finite graph set, has a universal object.*

An extension of this to relational structures is in [**144**], while the main result of [**297**] is that the universal object for the classes of the previous theorem can be obtained as a reduct of a so-called *generic structure*, which we now define.

One way to construct the countable random graph that is equivalent to the usual method is as a countable *generic structure* where generic means construction by finite approximations. Random graphs are defined in a space of graphs with a given property. The potential difficulties with this process are firstly that of defining a measure on this space and secondly that of determining whether or not a limit exists. Even if a limiting structure exists it could be a surprising one, as we shall see presently. That a random structure is not always equivalent to a generic structure is exemplified by triangle-free graphs. A triangle-free graph is generic if (i) it is countably infinite, (ii) a triangle of edges is not embeddable in it, (iii) it is homogeneous, and (iv) it is universal for finite triangle-free graphs. Such graphs provide an example of a structure whose large size limit is different to that which we would expect, for a random triangle-free graph is bipartite, meaning that if

$$a_n := \frac{\sharp\ n\text{-vertex bipartite graphs}}{\sharp\ \text{triangle-free } n\text{-vertex graphs}}$$

then $a_n \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$ [**203**]. (A bipartite graph is necessarily triangle-free. The generic triangle-free graph is Henson's graph $\mathfrak{H}_3$). By contrast, the class of cycle-free graphs fails to be universal for cycle-lengths greater than 3.

Hage et al. look at the switching operation of a graph transformation, from the viewpoint that it is a global transformation of a graph, achieved by applying local transformations to the vertices in the form of group actions. Switching classes grow rapidly and in [**260**], a study is made of detecting Euler, triangle-free and bipartite graphs in these classes.

Another example of a structure-free graph is the Covington graph $\mathfrak{N}$ [**159**] . There are no homogeneous N-*free* graphs, those which contain no induced path of length 3, because in such a graph any set of three vertices has the possibility of a distinguished vertex. The class $\mathbf{N}$ of N-free graphs does not have the amalgamation property, so no homogeneous graph has age $\mathbf{N}_f$, the class of finite N-free graphs. However $\mathfrak{N}$ is almost homogeneous and by the judicious addition of a ternary relation r to the language of graph theory, the failure of amalgamation can be repaired and the graph $\mathfrak{N}$ constructed as the unique countable universal N-free graph. So there is a countable homogeneous structure with age $\mathbf{N}[r]_f$.

The subject of homogenizability of structures has been studied by Kun and Nešetřil in [**343**].

We can say a little more detail about N-free graphs. The purpose of the ternary relation is to distinguish one of any triple of vertices. For triples where the induced subgraph is one of the following two,

one vertex (the uppermost one in the diagrams) is already distinguished by the graph structure. However consider the triangle subgraph.



FIGURE 10. Triangle subgraph

It is not possible to have two vertices, each with one neighbour in the triangle and these neighbours distinct, since neither of the the next two graphs (Figure 11) are N-free.

So if there is a vertex with one neighbour in the triangle, this neighbour is distinguished. If not, the ternary relation prescribes the only vertex which would be distinguished in this way in any N-free supergraph. Similar remarks hold for the subgraph



FIGURE 11. Non N-free supergraphs of the triangle subgraph

Our comments show that in the universal N-free graph, the ternary relation is determined by the graph structure. A list of areas where N-free graphs arise is given in [**159**].

In summary, although N-free graphs are not naturally homogeneous, they are homogenizable. If a structure is homogenizable then it is *generic*; we briefly say a little about this and expand on a similar concept of generic automorphism. A *generic structure* is one that is residual in some natural complete metric space in the sense of the *Baire category theorem* [**23**] (see Appendix 3). This says that we can put a natural metric structure on the class of all objects with a given *age* (see Appendix 4) or smaller, so that the isomorphism class of such objects is residual, or in other words that almost all objects look like the one we are interested in. The notion of *generic structures* includes homogeneous, $\aleph_0$-categorical as well as homogenizable structures, including N-free graphs.

A *generic automorphism* is one whose conjugacy class is large in the sense of Baire category. A homogeneous structure will have a generic automorphism, where a *generic element* of the automorphism group is one whose conjugacy class is residual, that is it lies in a comeagre conjugacy class relative to the given topology. Let G be a permutation group acting on a countably infinite set Ω. The natural topology on permutation groups is the *topology of pointwise convergence* in which for a sequence $g_n \in G$ of permutations $G = \mathrm{Sym}(X)$ on X, $\lim_{n\to\infty}(g_n) = g$ if and only if $\forall x_i \in X,\ \exists n_0 \in \omega$ such that $\forall n > n_0,\ x_i g_n = x_i g$. (We shall assume that the permutation groups have countable degree; for arbitrary degree we would have to consider limits of nets rather than

sequences.) Endowing a group G with this topology turns it into a *topological group*, that is multiplication and inversion are continuous, so that if $g_n \to g$ and $h_n \to h$ then $g_n h_n \to gh$ and $g_n^{-1} \to g^{-1}$. Further endowing G with a metric turns it into a complete metric space, so that we can use the Baire category theoretic notion of 'meagre' set (see Appendix 3). The topology is generated by basic open sets of the form $[p] = \{g \in G : g \text{ agrees with } p \text{ on its domain}\}$ where p is a 1–1 map from a finite subset of Ω to Ω. Given any relational or first-order structure, its automorphism group is a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ and so is automatically a complete metric space, and therefore we can talk about generic automorphisms. One way of capturing the notion of g being a 'typical' element is to require g to lie in certain *dense open sets*. An example of a dense open set for any g is $\{G \backslash g\}$.

Truss [**531**] undertook a study of generic automorphisms of homogeneous structures, proving the above results and that $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$, $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ the group of order automorphisms of the rationals (namely, $\{g \in \mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{Q}) : p < q \Leftrightarrow p^g < q^g, \forall p, q \in \mathbb{Q}\}$), all have generic elements with specified cycle types for such elements. More information on generic automorphisms, together with references can be found in Appendix 10.

A further sample to the literature on random graphs with forbidden substructures is [**106**] [**141**] [**142**] [**145**] [**229**] [**336**].

7. Properties of $S_{3,3}$

The main aim of this section is to discover the structure of the group $S_{3,3}$. This will help in finding the form of the more general switching groups $S_{m,n}$, a task that we delegate to section 11 of this chapter. We also learn some of the properties of the action of $S_{3,3}$ on complete graphs $\mathfrak{R}_{3,3} \in \mathcal{G}_{3,3}$ with 3 vertices (1, 2, 3) and 3 colours (i, j, k).

The possible switchings operations are given by



Following the notation established previously in this chapter, $\sigma_{i,j,1}$ means a switch of colours i and j whenever they occur on an edge about vertex 1. The 2^2 denotes the Klein 4-group generated along each row, and Sym(3) denotes the group generated along each column.

We will derive the group generated by these 9 involutions. Firstly note that five of the nine entries in this matrix are redundant as generators. Later, we will consider the 3-set embedded in an n-vertex graph; but for now, the three vertices of the 3-set are considered as comprising the whole graph. Any two of $\sigma_{i,j,X}$, $\sigma_{j,k,X}$ and $\sigma_{i,k,X}$ give the third. Also in both rows the product of two of the switchings equals the third. In other words, $\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{i,k,1}\sigma_{i,j,1} = \sigma_{j,k,1}$ and $\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{i,j,2} = \sigma_{i,j,3}$. So we actually need only consider four of the nine possible generators; without loss of generality we choose $\sigma_{i,j,1}$, $\sigma_{j,k,1}$, $\sigma_{i,j,2}$, $\sigma_{j,k,2}$.

We use GAP 4 to find the group generated by these on the $3^3 = 27$ graphs on ordered 3-sets, which are as follows. One way to label the 27 possible graphs is using elements of the set $\{0,\ldots,26\}$. We can parametrize the 3 possible colours on each of the 3 edges using ordered triples of numbers from $\{0,1,2\}$. So a coloured graph can be labelled using the 27 numbers $\{0,\ldots,26\}$ written in base 3 then adding 1, since GAP 4 assumes the set permuted is $\{1,\ldots,27\}$. By pairing-off switching-equivalent graphs, we can combine the resulting transpositions to form the four requisite generators, where each permutation runs into a second line:-

$$\texttt{P1} := \sigma_{i,j,1} = (1\ 7)(2\ 4)(3\ 8)(5\ 6)(9\ 18)(10\ 25)(11\ 20)(12\ 22)$$
$$(13\ 24)(16\ 19)(17\ 26)(21\ 27)$$
$$\texttt{P2} := \sigma_{j,k,1} = (1\ 14)(2\ 20)(3\ 23)(4\ 18)(5\ 26)(6\ 27)(9\ 11)$$
$$(10\ 15)(12\ 13)(16\ 24)(17\ 21)(19\ 22)$$
$$\texttt{P3} := \sigma_{i,j,,2} = (1\ 6)(2\ 8)(3\ 4)(5\ 7)(9\ 27)(10\ 19)(11\ 17)(12\ 22)$$
$$(14\ 23)(16\ 25)(18\ 21)(20\ 26)$$
$$\texttt{P4} := \sigma_{j,k,2} = (1\ 13)(2\ 24)(3\ 17)(4\ 19)(5\ 26)(7\ 25)(9\ 15)$$
$$(10\ 11)(12\ 14)(16\ 20)(18\ 22)(21\ 23)$$

The GAP 4 program gives information about the group $S_{3,3}$ which we denote $\texttt{G} = \langle \texttt{P1}, \texttt{P2}, \texttt{P3}, \texttt{P4} \rangle$. Rather than give the GAP 4 code, we merely summarize the information that we obtained about G, for example that its order is 108, together with the order and generators of the subgroups of G, and also which of these are primitive, Sylow, normal, nilpotent, Hall, abelian, transitive, maximal and so on. It is found that the Sylow 2-subgroups of G are not normal subgroups and so not unique, whilst G has a normal and therefore unique Sylow 3-subgroup. Also G is not nilpotent which implies that the the Sylow 2-subgroup

acts non-trivially on the Sylow 3-subgroup because in a finite group if the Sylow subgroups commute then the group is nilpotent.

That the orbit of G has 27 elements indicates a transitive group action on these 27 graphs, all of which lie in a single equivalence class. In other words, starting from any of the graphs, we can sequentially switch to get any of the other 26. This proves the following theorem:-

2.4. THEOREM. *Any two* 3*-vertex* 3*-colour graphs are switching-equivalent.*

PROOF. Given by the GAP 4 output. □

By using GAP 4 to give the order of the Sylow subgroup elements, we finally arrive at

$$S_{3,3} \cong (C_3 \times C_3 \times C_3) \rtimes (C_2 \times C_2)$$

This is the semidirect product of an elementary abelian 3-group and the Klein 4-group, the latter being the Sylow 2-subgroup $C_2 \times C_2$. So $S_{3,3}$ is metabelian, being an abelian extension of an abelian group.

The theory of groups with regular normal subgroups is relevant here. Now $N \cong C_3 \times C_3 \times C_3$, $N \lhd S_{3,3}$, and from the GAP 4 output N is transitive on the 27 graphs. A transitive abelian group is regular, so N is a regular normal subgroup of $S_{3,3}$. So $S_{3,3} = N \rtimes C_2 \times C_2 \leq N \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}(N)$. In our case $S_{3,3}$ is transitive on $\mathcal{G}_{3,3}$, (a result proved above in Theorem 2.4 and below for general m, n in Theorem 2.10 (a)), with $C_3 \times C_3 \times C_3$ as the regular normal subgroup being normalized by $C_2 \times C_2$, this latter assuming the role of the point stabilizer G_α.

If V is a vector space, N its additive group, and $H = GL(V)$, then $N \rtimes H \cong AGL(V)$ the *affine general linear group* (A transitive group G is *affine* if it has an elementary abelian regular normal subgroup.) In our case, N is a three-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{F}_3$, with $\mathrm{Aut}(N) \cong GL(3, \mathbb{F}_3)$. Next we derive the form of the elements of order 2 in $GL(3, \mathbb{F}_3)$. If a matrix A is taken to represent an involution, then $A^2 = 1 \Rightarrow (A + I)(A - I) = 0$. This is the minimal polynomial, so A is diagonalizable and has eigenvalues ± 1. Hence, A is similar to one of the following three matrices, A_1, A_2 or A_3, which up to conjugacy are:-

(i) $A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$

This corresponds to 9 fixed points and $\sharp$ 2-cycles is $(27 - 9)/2 = 9$.

(ii) $A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$

This corresponds to 3 fixed points and $\sharp$ 2-cycles is $(27 - 3)/2 = 12$.

(iii) $A_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$

This corresponds to 1 fixed point and $\sharp$ 2-cycles is $(27-1)/2 = 13$.

So the possible Klein 4-group is $V \cong \langle I, A, B, C \rangle$ where each of the three non-identity elements A, B, C is similar to one of the elements A_1, A_2, or A_3. GAP 4 gives V as having two generators, each having 12 orbits. So in our problem $A = A_2$, with three fixed points. By inspection of the GAP 4 orbit outputs, the three fixed points of the first orbit (that is generator) are $1, 2, 9$ and those of the second orbit are $1, 3, 10$. So the fixed point of the whole group is $\{1, 2, 9\} \cap \{1, 3, 10\} = 1$. So our particular Klein group turns out to be that for which all of A, B, C are similar to A_2.

Another representation in terms of matrices is given by

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \; B = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \; C = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Each element of the Klein 4-group has 3 fixed points and 12 transpositions. This has a geometrical interpretation in the projective plane. A collineation is an automorphism of a projective geometry $PG(n, \mathbb{F})$, mapping point sets and subspaces to each other. Each of A, B, C fix 3 points forming a basis, and thus one side (2 vertices) of the triangle together with the opposite vertex pointwise.



8. The Switching Reduct for Three Colours

To begin with we repeat some introductory material from earlier. Given a complete graph Γ with edges coloured red, blue and green, we define *blue-green switching* of Γ with respect to a set X of vertices as follows:

(a) for edges within X, or disjoint from X, the colours are unchanged;
(b) for edges with one end in X, the colour red is unchanged, while the colours blue and green are interchanged.

As with the usual concept of switching, this gives an equivalence relation on the set of graphs on a given vertex set: switching with respect to X and then with respect to X' is the same as switching with respect

to the symmetric difference of these sets. A *switching-automorphism* of Γ is an isomorphism from Γ to a graph equivalent to Γ under switching.

The *triality graph* $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is the countable universal homogeneous edge-colouring with three colours (which we take to be red, blue and green).

2.5. LEMMA. *If $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is switched with respect to a finite set X then the resulting graph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$.*

PROOF. Let Γ' be the result of switching Γ with respect to X, and let U, V, W be finite disjoint subsets of the vertex set. We seek a vertex z joined to these three sets by edges of colours red, blue, green respectively in Γ'. Now any vertex z will do this if it has the following properties in Γ:

(a) $z \notin X$;
(b) z is joined to U by red edges;
(c) z is joined to $(V \setminus X) \cup (W \cap X)$ by blue edges.
(d) z is joined to $(W \setminus X) \cup (V \cap X)$ by green edges.

But such a vertex exists in Γ by definition. □

2.6. THEOREM. *Let $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ be the triality graph. Then blue-green switching defines a (proper) reduct of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$.*

PROOF. We have to show two things:

(a) the group of switching-automorphisms is strictly larger than the group of automorphisms;
(b) this group is closed, that is, it is the automorphism group of some relational structure.

Part (a) is equivalent to showing that it is possible to switch Γ into a graph which is isomorphic to it but not identical; then the isomorphism is a switching-automorphism of Γ which is not an automorphism. In fact switching with respect to any non-empty finite set X does this.

For part (b), we observe that switching preserves the set of red edges, and also the parity of the number of blue edges in a blue-green triangle. The next result shows that a permutation which preserves both red edges and the parity of the number of blue edges in a blue-green triangle can be realized by a switching, and so that these properties define the appropriate reduct. □

Consider the situation where there are three colours called red, blue and green, and only blue-green switchings are permitted. This kind of switching has a geometrical interpretation. We are given a set of lines in Euclidean space making angles $\pi/2$ and α. Choose unit vectors along the lines; their Gram matrix has the form $I + (\cos\alpha)A$, where A is a

matrix with entries 0 and ±1. If colours red, blue, green correspond to entries 0, +1, −1 respectively, then changing the sign of a set of vectors corresponds to blue-green switching.

Blue-green switching clearly leaves all red edges unchanged. It also preserves an analogue of a two-graph, namely, the parity of the number of green edges (say) in any blue-green triangle. Is the converse true? Let us say that two 3-coloured complete graphs on V are *P-equivalent* if they have the same red edges and each blue-green triangle has the same parity of the number of green edges; and *S-equivalent* if one can be obtained from the other by blue-green switching.

P-equivalence does not imply S-equivalence in general. Suppose that Γ consists of a blue n-cycle (with $n \geq 4$), all other edges red. By switching, we can make any even number of edges in the cycle green; but any replacement of blue by green gives a P-equivalent graph.

However, the following is true [**125**]:

2.7. THEOREM. (a) *Any* 3*-coloured complete graph which is P-equivalent to the countable random* 3*-coloured complete graph* $\mathfrak{R}^t$ *is S-equivalent to* $\mathfrak{R}^t$.

(b) *Let* Γ *be a random finite* 3*-coloured complete graph. Then the probability of the event that every* 3*-coloured complete graph P-equivalent to* Γ *is S-equivalent to* Γ *tends to* 1 *as* $n \to \infty$.

PROOF. (a) Suppose that Γ_1 is the random 3-coloured complete graph $\mathfrak{R}^t$, and Γ_2 is a graph which is P-equivalent to Γ_1. We begin with some notation. We let $c_i(xy)$ denote the colour of the edge $\{x, y\}$ in Γ_i, and $R_i(v)$, $B_i(v)$, $G_i(v)$ the sets of vertices joined to v by red, blue, or green edges respectively in Γ_i, for $i = 1, 2$. We let $BG_i(v) = B_i(v) \cup G_i(v)$. In the proof we shall modify the graph Γ_2 so that various colours or sets become the same; once we know that, for example, $c_1(xy) = c_2(xy)$, we drop the subscript. Note that we can immediately write $R(v)$ and $BG(v)$, by the definition of P-equivalence.

Let $\Delta(v)$ be the symmetric difference of $B_1(v)$ and $B_2(v)$. Switching Γ_2 with respect to $\Delta(v)$ gives a new graph Γ_2' such that all edges containing v have the same colour in Γ_1 and Γ_2'. Now replacing Γ_2 by Γ_2', we may assume that this holds for Γ_2.

Now the subgraphs on $\{v\} \cup BG(v)$ are identical in Γ_1 and Γ_2. For let $x, y \in BG(v)$. If $c_1(xy)$ is red, the result is clear. Otherwise, $c_1(vx) = c_2(vx)$ and $c_1(vy) = c_2(vy)$, and so $c_1(xy) = c_2(xy)$ by hypothesis.

Next we claim that, for any two vertices $x, y \in R(v)$, the edges from x and y to $BG(v)$ are either of the same colour in the two graphs, or differ by an interchange of blue and green. Suppose that $c_1(xz) = c_2(xz)$ is blue or green for some $z \in BG(v)$. Let $z' \in BG(v)$ be another point such that $c_1(xz')$ is blue or green; we must show that $c_1(xz') = c_2(xz')$. If $c(zz')$ is blue or green, then this assertion follows by hypothesis. But since $\Gamma_1 \cong \mathfrak{R}^t$, the blue-green graph on $BG(v) \cap BG(x)$ is connected. (The induced structure on this set is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}^t$, so any two vertices in $BG(v) \cap BG(x)$ are joined by a blue-green path of length at most 2). So the claim follows.

Now $R(v) = R^+(v) \cup R^-(v)$, where, for $x \in R(v)$, the colours of edges from x to $BG(v)$ are the same in Γ_1 and Γ_2 if $x \in R^+(v)$, and differ by a blue-green exchange if $x \in R^-(v)$. Let Γ_2' be obtained by switching Γ_2 with respect to $R^-(v)$. This switching doesn't change the colours in $\{v\} \cup BG(v)$, and has the result that $R^-(v)$ is empty in the switched graph. Replacing Γ_2 by Γ_2', we may assume that edges between $R(v)$ and $BG(v)$ have the same colour in Γ_1 and Γ_2.

Finally, take $x, y \in R(v)$ with $c_1(xy)$ blue or green. Again, since $\Gamma_1 \cong \mathfrak{R}^t$, there exists $z \in BG(v)$ such that $c(xz)$ and $c(yz)$ are each blue or green. That is, such a configuration must exist within the triality graph by universality. Then by hypothesis we ensure that $c_1(xy) = c_2(xy)$. So $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2$. Since we switched the original Γ_2 twice in the course of the proof, the proposition is proved.

(b) The above argument only depends on the existence of one vertex joined to at most four given vertices by blue or green edges. It is straightforward to show that this property holds in almost all random 3-coloured finite complete graphs. We omit the details. □

2.8. Corollary. *The group of switching automorphisms corresponding to blue-green switchings is a reduct of* $\mathfrak{R}^t$.

Proof. This group preserves the first-order structure with two relations, namely adjacency in the red edges in the graph, and the ternary relation picking out the blue-green triangles with an odd number of green edges. □

The theorem can be expressed in another way, following [**79**]. Consider the red graph as given. Let $\mathcal{C}_2$ be the 2-dimensional complex whose simplices are the vertices, edges, and triangles in the blue-green graph. Then P- and S-equivalence classes of the colouring with no green edges are 1-cocycles and 1-coboundaries over $\mathbb{Z}_2$; so the cohomology group $H^1(\mathcal{C}_2, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ measures the extent to which P-equivalence fails to imply S-equivalence. The theorem asserts that this cohomology

vanishes in the infinite random structure and in almost all finite structures. The Theorem of Mallows and Sloane whose own proof differs from that we gave above, has yet another proof [**79**] using the same algebro-geometric formalism of this paragraph.

The most general type of restricted switching works as follows. Let G be a group of permutations on the set of colours (a subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$). A switching operation has the form $\sigma_{g,X}$ for $g \in G$ and $X \subseteq V$; it applies the permutation g to the colours of edges between X and its complement, and leaves other colours unaltered. We refer to this operation as *G-restricted switching*.

We record one simple observation. If the derived group $[G, G]$ of G is a transitive subgroup of G, then all m-coloured graphs on the finite set V are equivalent under G-restricted switching. The proof is the same as that of Theorem 2.10 below.

Remarks

1. For ordinary switching (the two-coloured case, corresponding to switching on blue and green edges only), it is well known that two graphs are switching-equivalent if and only if the parities of the numbers of blue edges in any triangle are the same in the two graphs. This is not true for three colours; whilst S-equivalence implies P-equivalence, the example of the n-cycle for $n > 3$ given before Theorem 2.7 shows that the converse is false.

2. For any number of colours equal to or greater than three, the group of switchings for a given pair of colours (leaving all others unchanged) is a reduct of the corresponding universal homogeneous structure. This is proved by the previous argument, by just regarding all colours except blue or green as red. This gives the triality graph.

9. Switching on More Than Two Colours: The Finite Case

The theory of switching with more than two colours is radically different from the two-coloured case. We begin with a useful lemma which in fact applies to graphs with either a finite or an infinite number of vertices.

2.9. Lemma. *Consider the m-edge-coloured graph Γ, where $m \geq 3$, (or any of its finite subgraphs). The colour of any edge can be switched to any other colour independently of all other edges.*

Proof. Let the three colours be $\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}$. Let the edge between vertices 1 and 2 be coloured $\mathfrak{r}$ and say we wanted to switch this to $\mathfrak{g}$ leaving unchanged all other colours on all other edges. We have the following situation:



We want to prove that we can make all edges joined to 1 have colour $\mathfrak{b}$ except $\{1,2\}$, so that we can simply switch about vertex 1 from $\mathfrak{r}$ to $\mathfrak{g}$, and undo all the other unwanted colour changes. Let $v_{\mathfrak{r}_1}, v_{\mathfrak{r}_2}, \ldots$ be those vertices attached to vertex 1 with red-coloured edges $e_{\mathfrak{r}_1}, e_{\mathfrak{r}_2}, \ldots$ (apart from $\mathfrak{r}$ between $\{1,2\}$). Let $v_{\mathfrak{g}_1}, v_{\mathfrak{g}_2}, \ldots$ be those vertices attached to vertex 1 with green-coloured edges $e_{\mathfrak{g}_1}, e_{\mathfrak{g}_2}$,
.... Perform a switch $\sigma_{\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b}}$ about $v_{\mathfrak{r}_1}, v_{\mathfrak{r}_2}, \ldots$ and a switch $\sigma_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ about $v_{\mathfrak{g}_1}, v_{\mathfrak{g}_2}, \ldots$. Then we get



Now perform the switch $\sigma'_{\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{g}}$ about vertex 1 to get the requisite edge colour change on $\{1,2\}$. Next redo the switchings $\sigma_{\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b}}$ about $v_{\mathfrak{r}_1}, v_{\mathfrak{r}_2}, \ldots$ and $\sigma_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}$ about $v_{\mathfrak{g}_1}, v_{\mathfrak{g}_2}, \ldots$ in the reverse order. Because the switchings are involutions, this undoes the unwanted changes leaving as the only change that edge $\{1,2\}$ goes from $\mathfrak{r}$ to $\mathfrak{g}$, and restoring the colours on the edges adjoining $v_{\mathfrak{r}_i}$ and $v_{\mathfrak{g}_j}$. □

Whilst the last lemma applies to graphs with either a finite or an infinite number of vertices, the next theorem is restricted to finite graphs. It shows that there is only one switching class, and that the group of switching automorphisms of any graph is the symmetric group.

2.10. THEOREM. *Let m and n be positive integers with $m > 2$.*
(a) The group $S_{m,n}$ acts transitively on the set $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$ of m-edge-coloured graphs on n vertices.
(b) For any m-edge-coloured graph Γ on n vertices, the group $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ *of switching automorphisms of Γ is the symmetric group* $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$.

PROOF. (a) Observe that $[\sigma_{c,d,\{x\}}, \sigma_{d,e,\{y\}}] = (\sigma_{c,d,\{x\}}\sigma_{d,e,\{y\}})^2$. This has the effect of permuting the triplet of colours (c,d,e) to (d,e,c). So the commutator $[\sigma_{c,d,\{x\}}, \sigma_{d,e,\{y\}}]$ induces the 3-cycle (c,d,e) on the colours on the edge $\{x,y\}$ and acts as the identity on the colours on all other edges. Now these 3-cycles generate the direct product of alternating groups – a product indexed by 2-subsets of $\{1,\ldots,n\}$. Hence result.

(b) Obvious, for $S_{m,n}$ acts transitively so any graph configuration can be switched to any other. This is equivalent to proving the group is $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$. □

This theorem more or less demolishes the theory of switching classes for more than two colours. However, the problem of determining the structure of the group of switching operations remains and is dealt with in a separate section.

2.11. THEOREM. *The group* $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ *of switching automorphisms of* $\mathfrak{R}^t$ *is highly vertex transitive.*

PROOF. Take a bijection between finite sets of vertices, $\alpha : A \to B$ in $\mathfrak{R}^t$. There is a switching $\sigma \in S_{3,\omega}$ which has the property that for any $x, y \in A$, $c(x\alpha, y\alpha)^\sigma = c(x, y)$, where $c(x, y)$ denotes the colour of the edge between vertices x and y. Then α is an isomorphism from A (in $\mathfrak{R}^t$) to B (in $\mathfrak{R}^{t^\sigma}$). So it extends to an isomorphism $\beta : \mathfrak{R}^t \to \mathfrak{R}^{t^\sigma}$. Then by definition $\beta \in \mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ and β extends α. Therefore $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ is highly transitive. □

Whilst we have proved this theorem for $\mathfrak{R}^t$, a similar proof will prove that the m-coloured random graphs are highly vertex transitive for all finite $m \geq 3$. The edge-transitivity of $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ follows from its 2-transitivity on vertices.

Remarks

1. That $\mathfrak{R}^t$ is homogeneous is already a very strong symmetry condition; it implies the transitivity of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ on vertices and on adjacencies of a particular colour.

2. That the switching group is highly transitive is equivalent to saying that its closure is $\mathrm{Sym}(V)$, that is the group of all permutations whose effects can be undone by some switching. Alternatively it is dense in $\mathrm{Sym}(V)$. (A group H that is a subgroup of a closed group $G \leq \mathrm{Sym}(X)$ is *dense* in G if and only if it has the same orbits as G on finite ordered subsets of X). In the next section we will see that $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}^t) \neq \mathrm{Sym}(V)$ and so it is not a reduct. There are switchings α with respect to an infinite number of vertices so that $(\mathfrak{R}^t)^\alpha = \mathfrak{R}^t$. Indeed switching with respect to a random subset of vertices almost surely gives $\mathfrak{R}^t$.

10. Switching on More Than Two Colours: The Infinite Case

What about infinite multicoloured graphs?

We assume that the graphs have countably many vertices. In the two-coloured case, the situation is like that for the finite case. But for more than two colours, there are significant differences.

We begin by observing that $S_{m,\omega}$ does not act transitively on $\mathcal{G}_{m,\omega}$: there is no sequence of switching operations which maps an infinite graph with all edges of one colour to one with all edges of a different colour. This follows from the following characterisation of the switching class of a monochromatic complete graph.

2.12. Lemma. *The following conditions on a countable m-coloured graph Γ are equivalent for $m > 2$:*

(a) Γ is obtained from a c-coloured clique by switching;

(b) there is an equivalence relation on Γ with finitely many equivalence classes such that, if $x \equiv y$ and $x \neq y$, then $\{x, y\}$ has colour c, and $\{x, z\}$ and $\{y, z\}$ have the same colour for all $z \neq x, y$.

Proof. (a) implies (b): Any element of the group of switching operations is a product of finitely many switchings σ_{c_i,d_i,Y_i} for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Now the infinite set X is partitioned into at most 2^n sets Y_J for $J \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$, where

$$Y_J = \{x \in X : (x \in Y_i) \Leftrightarrow (i \in J)\}.$$

Now edges joining vertices in the same set Y_J have their colours unaltered by the given sequence of switchings, so have colour c; and if x and y belong to the same one of these sets and z is any other vertex, then the colours of $\{x, z\}$ and $\{y, z\}$ experience the same sequence of changes.

(b) implies (a): suppose that (b) holds. We form a new graph $\hat{\Gamma}$ whose vertices are the equivalence classes of vertices of Γ, with an edge coloured d from Y_1 to Y_2 if the edges from vertices in Y_1 to vertices in Y_2 have colour d in Γ. The graph $\hat{\Gamma}$ is finite; so, by Theorem 2.10, we can switch it so that all edges have colour c. The corresponding sequence of switchings of Γ changes the colours of all edges between equivalence classes to c, and does not alter the colours of edges within classes. So a c-coloured complete graph results. □

A graph Γ is a *switched c-clique* if the equivalent conditions of Lemma 2.12 hold. Note that every subgraph of a switched c-clique is a switched c-clique. Note also that an infinite graph cannot be both

a switched c-clique and a switched d-clique for $c \neq d$, since a switched c-clique has no infinite clique of colour different from c.

A *moiety* in a countably infinite set X is an infinite subset Y of X such that $X \setminus Y$ is also infinite.

2.13. LEMMA. *A countably infinite multicoloured graph is a switched c-clique if and only if the vertex set can be partitioned into three moieties such that the induced subgraph on the union of any two is a switched c-clique.*

PROOF. The forward implication is clear. So suppose that X is the disjoint union of Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, and for each $i \neq j$, there is an equivalence relation $\equiv_{ij}$ on $Y_i \cup Y_j$ with the properties of Lemma 2.12. Extend $\equiv_{ij}$ to an equivalence relation on X in which the remaining set Y_k is a single class. Let $\equiv$ be the meet of these three equivalence relations.

We claim that $\equiv$ has the properties of Lemma 2.12. Certainly it has only finitely many classes. Take two points x, y in the same class. Then they belong to the same set Y_i, say Y_1 without loss of generality. Since $x \equiv_{12} y$, the edge $\{x, y\}$ has colour c. Now let z be any point in a different equivalence class. Suppose, without loss of generality, that $z \in Y_1 \cup Y_2$. Then the properties of $\equiv_{12}$ ensure that $\{x, z\}$ and $\{y, z\}$ have the same colour. □

Now we can characterise multicoloured graphs for which the group of switching automorphisms is the symmetric group.

2.14. THEOREM. *Let Γ be an m-coloured graph on a countable set X, where $m > 2$. Then the group of switching automorphisms of Γ is the symmetric group on X if and only if Γ is a switched c-clique for some colour c.*

PROOF. Since switching does not change the group of switching automorphisms, the reverse implication is clear. So suppose that $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{Sym}(X)$. By Ramsey's Theorem, there is a moiety Y of X which is a c-clique for some colour c. Since $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$ is transitive on moieties, every moiety is a switched c-clique. Now Lemma 2.13 gives the result. □

So the group of switching automorphisms is not in general equal to the symmetric group; in particular if the m-coloured graph contains infinite monochromatic subgraphs in two different colours. Equivalently, if $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{Sym}(X)$ there is only one colour for which Γ contains an infinite monochromatic clique. In particular $\mathfrak{R}^t$ contains infinite monochromatic cliques of all 3 colours, so $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}^t) \neq \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$. Hence $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ is not a reduct of $\mathfrak{R}^t$.

For completeness we can give some instances of countable graphs Γ with at least three colours for which the group of switching automorphisms is *not* highly transitive.

Example

If V is the disjoint union of two infinite sets V_1 and V_2, where edges within V_1 are red, edges within V_2 are blue, and edges between V_1 and V_2 are blue, then $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ contains $\mathrm{FSym}(V)$. For although the graph is not a switched c-clique, so that $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma) \neq \mathrm{Sym}(V)$, because $\mathrm{FSym}(V)$ permutes only a finite number of vertices and only a finite number of edge colours are present, Lemma 2.9 gives that $\mathrm{FSym}(V) \leq \mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$. The following statements can easily be proved:

(a) in this case $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ is the product of $\mathrm{FSym}(V)$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(V_1) \times \mathrm{Sym}(V_2)$;

(b) in general, if Γ has a finite partition $V = V_1 \cup \ldots \cup V_k$ such that all edges within a single part of the partition have the same colour, while the colour of an edge from V_i to V_j depend only on i and j, then $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ contains $\mathrm{FSym}(\Gamma)$.

The converse statement of (b) would be: if $\mathrm{FSym}(V) \leq \mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ then Γ has a finite partition of vertex sets, such that each part is monochromatic and the colour of edges joining any two parts is only dependent on those parts. This is unknown.

A permutation $g \in \mathrm{Sym}(X)$ of X is an *almost automorphism* of a multicoloured graph Γ on X if the colour of $\{xg, yg\}$ is equal to the colour of $\{x, y\}$ for all but finitely many 2-element subsets of X. The group of such almost automorphisms is denoted $\mathrm{AAut}(\Gamma)$. In the two-colour case, this group has been investigated by Truss and others [**392**] [**529**].

2.15. Theorem. *Suppose that $m > 2$. Then the group $\mathrm{AAut}(\Gamma)$ of almost automorphisms of any m-edge-coloured countably infinite graph Γ is contained in the group $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ of switching automorphisms.*

Proof. Just as in the finite case (Theorem 2.10), we can change the colour of any single edge (and hence of any finite number of edges) by a sequence of switchings. Any finite number of colour changes can be switched back. □

For finite graphs we have the equivalence $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{AAut}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{Sym}(\Gamma)$. However the containment in Theorem 2.15 is proper in the case of $\Gamma = \mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$. For switching with respect to a random subset of vertices almost surely gives $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$, that is the exceptions which do not give this graph form a null set in the sense of measure. So there is a

switching automorphism changing the colours on infinitely many edges which is therefore not an almost automorphism.

As we shall see in the next paragraph, the group of almost automorphisms of the universal homogeneous multicoloured graph is highly transitive so cannot be a non-trivial reduct, since any closed subgroup of the symmetric group is the automorphism group of a relational structure. Furthermore $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is highly transitive. In summary, for $m \geq 3$,

$$\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) < \mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) < \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}).$$

Let f_m be the colouring function on the set of unordered vertex pairs of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ into the set $\mathcal{C}_m$ of m edge colours, satisfying the following universality property: if $\alpha : \mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega} \to \mathcal{C}_m$ is a finite partial map then $\exists x \in \mathrm{dom}(\alpha)$ such that $\forall y \in \mathrm{dom}(\alpha)\ \alpha(y) = f_m\{x, y\}$. If $m = 2$, then $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{0, 1\}$ and vertices $x, y \in \mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ are joined if $f_2\{x, y\} = 1$. The main result required to prove that $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is a highly transitive permutation group on $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ for $m \geq 2$ [**82**] is the following lemma, which is proved using the universality property and a back-and-forth argument,

2.16. Lemma. *Let $p : \mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega} \to \mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ be a finite partial bijection. Then $\exists g \in \mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ extending p, which is a permutation of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$, and is such that if $f_m\{gx, gy\} \neq f_m\{x, y\}$ then $x, y \in \mathrm{dom}(p)$.*

An alternative form of the lemma is

2.17. Lemma. *Let edges $e_1, e_2 \in E(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ be such $f_m(e_1) \neq f_m(e_2)$. Then $\exists g \in \mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ with $|\{e_i \in E(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) : f_m(ge_i) \neq f_m(e_i)\}| = 1$, such that $ge_1 = e_2$.*

We leave the proofs of these lemmas as exercises for the interested reader.

11. Derivation of the Form of $S_{m,n}$

We turn our attention to determining the form of the finite switching groups.

2.18. Proposition. *The switching group $S_{m,3}$ on 3 vertices and m colours is a normal subgroup of index 2 in the direct product of 3 symmetric groups of degree m.*

Proof. Denote the switching group in question by $S_{m,3}$. For $n = 3 = m$, we have seen above that $|S_{3,3}| = 108$. Also $|(\mathrm{Sym}(3))^3| = 216$, so $|(\mathrm{Sym}(3))^3 : S_{3,3}| = 2$ and $S_{3,3} \lhd (\mathrm{Sym}(3))^3$.

Proceed inductively on m. We have $S_{m,3}$ acting on m^3 triples of colours, and we want to show that $|(\mathrm{Sym}(m))^3 : S_{m,3}| = 2$, for which we

would require $|S_{m,3}| = (m!)^3/2$. For then, by the inductive hypothesis, $|S_{m-1,3}| = ((m-1)!)^3/2$, and the assertion $|(\mathrm{Sym}(m))^3 : S_{m-1,3}|.|S_{m,3} : S_{m-1,3}|^{-1} = 2$ would follow and would give the result if we could show that $|S_{m,3} : S_{m-1,3}| = m^3$. So it remains to prove this last equation. The transitivity of $S_{m,3}$ as given by Theorem 2.10 implies that this group acts transitively on triples of colours. Also, since the stabilizer of the graph with all edges coloured m is $S_{m-1,3}$, and each entry in the triple can either stay the same colour m, or change to one of the other $m-1$ colours, this gives m^3 possibilities, and proves the proposition. □

This leads us to our desired result, which is a generalization of Seidel's which states that $|S_{2,n}| = 2^{n-1}$.

2.19. Theorem. *The group of all switchings on n-vertex subgraphs having m colours is given by*

$$S_{m,n} \cong (\mathrm{Alt}(m))^{n(n-1)/2} \rtimes (C_2)^{n-1}.$$

Proof. The semidirect product action here partitions the vertex set into two parts and the C_2 groups transpose the colours on edges crossing the partition.

Take any edge $\{x, y\}$ and any three colours a, b, c. Then $\sigma_{a,b,\{x\}}\sigma_{a,c,\{y\}}$ induces the 3-cycle (a, c, b) on the colours on $\{x, y\}$, the 2-cycle (a, b) on edges $\{x, z\}$, the 2-cycle (a, c) on edges $\{y, z\}$ (where $z \notin \{x, y\}$), and the identity on all other edges. (This is the content of Lemma 2.9). So the square of this element induces (a, b, c) on $\{x, y\}$ and the identity elsewhere, for $\sigma^{-1}\xi^{-1}\sigma\xi = (\sigma\xi)^2$. Since 3-cycles generate the alternating group, we get $\mathrm{Alt}(m)$ on the colours on $\{x, y\}$, and hence the direct product of $\binom{n}{2}$ alternating groups overall.

Now there is a homomorphism from $S_{m,n}$ to $S_{2,n}$, where the parity of the permutation on the m colours at an edge determines whether the two colours are switched or not. The kernel is the product of alternating groups just constructed, and the image is the whole group $S_{2,n}$, whose structure we know by the result of Seidel. □

12. Primitivity of Extended Switching Group Actions

There are two actions of $S_{m,n}$ (and $S_{m,n} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$):-

(i) on the set of coloured edges. This is imprimitive because the "same edge" is a congruence, that is all pairs with a fixed edge form a block of imprimitivity;

(ii) on the set of all edge-coloured graphs. In this, more natural action, $S_{m,n}$ is transitive. We will show that this action of $S_{m,n} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$, where $S_{m,n}$ acts as $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ on the colours of each edge and $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ acts transitively on the $\binom{n}{2}$ pairs, is primitive for $m \geq 3$. However $S_{m,n}$

by itself is imprimitive in this action, for take an edge e and colour c, then the set of all graphs in which the colour of e is c forms a block of imprimitivity.

Take the group $G^W_{m,n}$ to be a subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(m) \operatorname{Wr} \mathrm{Sym}\binom{n}{2}$ with the product action. The group $G^W_{m,n}$ acts on the set $\Omega = \Gamma^\Delta$ of functions from Δ to Γ, where colour set $|\Gamma| = m$ and the set of vertex pairs is $|\Delta| = \binom{n}{2}$, and is *non-basic*, that is preserving a non-trivial product structure (defined to be a bijection $\Omega \to \Gamma^\Delta$ for $|\Gamma|, |\Delta| > 1$). The domain for the product action is the set of global sections (or transversals or functions $\Delta \to \Gamma$) for the fibres. Each fibre represents the set of colourings on a particular edge, and a transversal represents a complete colouring of the graph. The bottom groups $\mathrm{Alt}(m)$ are primitive and non-regular on Γ if $m > 3$, as is necessary for a primitive $G^W_{m,n}$ product action on Ω. Notice that $\mathrm{Alt}(m) \operatorname{Wr} \mathrm{Sym}(n) \leq G^W_{m,n} \leq \mathrm{Sym}(m) \operatorname{Wr} \mathrm{Sym}(n)$. Now $\mathrm{Alt}(m) \operatorname{Wr} \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ is primitive if $m > 3$, for by an argument in the proof of the O'Nan–Scott Theorem: $A \operatorname{Wr} B$ is primitive in the product action if and only if the action of A on each coordinate or fibre of Γ is primitive and non-regular, and B is transitive [**177**].

The cases $m = 3$ and $m \geq 4$ can be separately dealt with. Firstly for $m \geq 4$ we have that $S_{m,n} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ has a natural action on $S_{m,n}$ and it lies between $\mathrm{Alt}(m) \operatorname{Wr} \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(m) \operatorname{Wr} \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ in the product action. For $m > 3$ we have that $\mathrm{Alt}(m)$ is primitive and not regular and also $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ is transitive on $\binom{n}{2}$ edges. Firstly this is equivalent to saying that $\mathrm{Alt}(m) \operatorname{Wr} \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ is primitive, and secondly it implies that $S_{m,n} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ is primitive, as it lies above a primitive group [**177**].

For $m = 3$, note that $\mathrm{Alt}(3) = C_3$. Now, a group of the form $G = C_p^l \rtimes H \cong C_p \operatorname{Wr} H$ acts on $(\mathbb{Z}/p)^l$ (an l-dimensional vector space V over the finite field $\mathrm{GF}(p)$) with $H \leq GL(l,p)$ being transitive of degree l. The group G acts transitively because C_p^l does.

Consider

$$C_3^{\binom{n}{2}} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n) \leq G^W_{3,n} \leq \mathrm{Sym}(3)^{\binom{n}{2}} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n),$$

where the symmetric group action has degree $\binom{n}{2}$. Here $G^W_{3,n}$ is the semi-direct product $\left(C_3^{\binom{n}{2}}.C_2^{(n-1)}\right) \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$. In our case $l = \binom{n}{2}, p = 3, H = C_2^{n-1} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$. We can parametrize the 3 colours as $\{0, \pm 1\}$, so that the group C_2 acts to stabilize 0 and transpose + and −. We need to show that H is irreducible on V. Let W be an H-invariant subspace of V. Take $w \in W$ to be a function from edges to $\{0, \pm 1\}$ with fewest nonzero coordinates. Apply any vertex permutation or switching fixing

the 0 coordinates and changing the signs of the others. We claim that all edges on which $w \neq 0$ pass through the same vertex.

For let i be any vertex such that $w \neq 0$ on some edge through that vertex. Switch + and − at edges through i and subtract from original to get $w - w^\sigma = x$, where $x = 0$ on all edges not containing i. Also $x(\{i,j\}) = -w(\{i,j\})\ \forall j$, and is nonzero on all edges containing i where w is nonzero, that is $x \in W,\ x \neq 0$. Also x has fewer non-zero coordinates than w (when $w = 0$ on edges not containing i).

Further $w \neq 0$ only on a single edge. Suppose that $w(\{i,j\}) \neq 0$. Switching at j gives $w^\sigma(\{i,j\}) = -w(\{i,j\})$ and if $k \neq i,j$ $w^\sigma(\{i,k\}) = w(\{i,k\})$. So $w - w^\sigma$ is nonzero only on i,j. So $W = V$.

As $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ acts transitively on edges so for each edge there exists $w \in W$ which is non-zero only on that edge. These span V. Therefore $W = V$. So $G^W_{3,n}$ is primitive and finally we can state the result

2.20. Theorem. *The group $S^*_{m,n} := S_{m,n} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ acts primitively on $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$, for $m \geq 3$.*

This result can be seen as a strengthening of Theorem 2.10.

Once again just as we saw above for the theory of switching classes we have a contrast between the $m = 2$ random graph where $S^*_{2,n}$ has non-trivial switching orbits for $n \geq 3$, and the higher-adjacency graphs where $S^*_{m,n}$ acts primitively for $m \geq 3$. In fact $S^*_{2,n}$ is not even transitive; its orbits are isomorphism classes of switching classes. For three vertex graphs there are two switching classes of four graphs:



FIGURE 12. Two switching classes for $S_{2,3}$

13. Transitive Extensions

At this point, we can discern a property of the switching groups that is alluded to by some of the results of the previous sections.

Let H be a permutation group acting on a set Σ. We say that the permutation group G is a *transitive extension* of H if it acts on $\Omega = \Sigma \cup \{*\}$ such that H is the stabilizer of point $*$ acting on Σ. A *weak transitive extension* is a transitive permutation group G acting on $\Omega = \Sigma \cup \{*\} \cup \Gamma$ such that $G_{\{*\}}$ setwise stabilizes Σ and acts on Σ as H. Here Γ is a set of points such that $\Sigma \cap \Gamma = \varnothing$. Every multiply transitive group arises from some other group by transitive extension.

As an illustration of the difference between transitive extensions and weak transitive extensions, we note that the Klein 4-group has no transitive extension [**177**, p. 232], so we would not get a transitive extension with respect to a 5-vertex set, but there is a weak one. This is further illustrated by the following two examples:

Examples of Weak Transitive Extensions

1. The action of $\mathrm{Sym}(3) \times \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ on the nine points $\{(i,j) : 1 \leq i,j \leq 3\}$. The stabilizer of the point $* = (3,3)$ is $\mathrm{Sym}(2) \times \mathrm{Sym}(2) \cong V_4$ with $\Sigma = \{(1,1),(1,2),(2,1),(2,2)\}$.

2. Consider the action of $S_{3,3}$ acting on ordered triples with elements $1,2,3$,



Recall that $|S_{3,3}| = 27.4$. Here $G = S_{3,3}$ and

$* =$ 

The pointwise stabilizer $G_{\{*\}} \cong V_4$ has two orbits of 4 graphs each as shown in Figure 13.

Contrast this to the case where $m \geq 4$ where there is only one switching class.

As a corollary to the high-transitivity of $S_{m,n}$ we find,

2.21. Theorem. *For $3 \leq n \leq \aleph_0$, $3 \leq m < \aleph_0$ and for a fixed value of n, the groups in the series of multiply transitive groups given by*

$$S_{3,n} \leq S_{4,n} \leq \ldots \leq S_{m-1,n} \leq S_{m,n} \leq \ldots$$



FIGURE 13. Example of weak transitive extension of $S_{3,3}$

each form a weak transitive extension *of the previous group in the series, in their action on the set of all m-coloured graphs on n vertices.*

PROOF. The stabilizer in $S_{m,n}$ of a graph X with all edges coloured m, fixes the set of all graphs not using colour m and acts as $S_{m-1,n}$ on this set. Clearly $S_{m-1,n} \leq S_{m,n}$ and fixes X. So $S_{m-1,n} \leq (S_{m,n})_X$. So by Theorem 2.19 for the first equality and the Orbit-Stabilizer Theorem for the last, $|S_{m,n} : S_{m-1,n}| = m^{\binom{n}{2}} = \sharp$ coloured graphs on m colours $= |S_{m,n} : (S_{m,n})_X|$. Therefore from the containment and dimension arguments, $S_{m-1,n} = (S_{m,n})_X$. □

We end the section with an observation on generalized two-graphs.

Recall that two 3-coloured complete graphs on V are *P-equivalent* if they have the same red edges and each blue-green triangle has the same parity of the number of green edges. This can be extended to any number of colours by defining two m-coloured complete graphs as *P_m-equivalent* if they have the same edges on $m-2$ colours and the same parity of the number of green edges in each blue-green triangle.



FIGURE 14. Relations between generalized two-graph and random graph automorphism groups

Adding the point at infinity to the vertex set of an m-coloured random graph to get $V(\mathfrak{R}^{+}_{m,\omega}) = V(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \cup \{\mathfrak{O}\}$ gives a new structure, $\mathcal{T}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ such that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}))$ is a transitive extension of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$. For $m = 2$, $\mathcal{T}(\mathfrak{R})$ is the unique countable universal homogeneous two-graph. In fact $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}(\mathfrak{R}))$ is a *curious transitive extension* of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ [**101**], that is it has a transitive subgroup on $V(\mathfrak{R}^{+})$ which is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$. This carries through for $m \geq 3$ and we obtain Figure 14 as a result, where the ι maps are inclusions and the e maps are curious transitive extensions. The ι inclusions follow by considering the partition of the sets that make up the generalized two-graphs on different numbers of colours, and going colourblind in successive pairs of colours.

CHAPTER 3

Finitary Switching Groups

To my own Gods I go.
It may be they shall give me greater ease
Than your ... tangled Trinities.

Rudyard Kipling, *Plain Tales from the Hills, 'Lisbeth'*

The next dream I want to present is an even more fantastic set of theorems and conjectures. Here I also have no theory and actually the ideas form a kind of religion rather than mathematics. The key observation is that in mathematics one encounters many trinities.

V. I. Arnold, *The Arnoldfest, Fields Institute Communications vol.24, p.32, eds. E. Bierstone* et al.*, 1999*

In general, whilst few permutation groups are finitary, there are many infinitary ones such as any infinite group acting by the right regular action; in fact regular infinite groups are as cofinitary as it is possible to achieve.

This chapter deals with variations on the switching group theme, beginning with a specific instance of finitary action, that is assuming that there are infinitely many colours, but allowing switchings only on the first m colours, the colours $m+1, m+2, \ldots$ all being stabilized under group action. Whilst the switchings are finitary the action of the group on vertices will not be. Label the infinitely many colours $1, 2, 3, \ldots$ and let $\mathcal{C}_m = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ denote the set of the first m colours. Define the *finitary switching group* acting on the relevant infinite graphs, to be the group generated by switchings of pairs of the first m colours, writing this as $S^f_{m,\omega} = \langle \sigma_{c,d,X} : X \subseteq V \text{and } c, d \in \mathcal{C}_m \rangle$, where V is the vertex set of the graph, $|V| = \omega$. The union $\bigcup_{m \geq 3} S^f_{m,\omega}$ is then the group of all finitary switchings. The action of such groups is not transitive for by Lemmas 2.12 and 2.13 we cannot switch the complete red-coloured graph to the complete blue-coloured graph.

1. Basic Properties

Our aim in this first section is to uncover results on the way to finding the structure of the *full (or unrestricted) switching group*, $S_{\omega,\omega}$ of all possible switchings, to be defined below. First we précis our findings on switching groups so far.

The finite switching groups can be extended by defining $S^*_{m,n} := S_{m,n} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ which is a group generated by the switchings and the vertex permutations. It is well defined since $\sigma^g_{c,d,X} = \sigma_{c,d,X^g}$ for $g \in \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ and so $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ normalizes $S_{m,n}$. For any coloured graph Γ, the group $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ of switching automorphisms of Γ is the stabilizer of Γ in $S^*_{m,n}$ – equivalently, it is the group of vertex permutations g such that $\Gamma g = \Gamma\sigma$ for some switching σ. For $m = 2$, $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ is isomorphic to the group of automorphisms of the two-graph derived from Γ, and so cannot be more than 2-transitive unless Γ is trivial; only if Γ is trivial, that is has just a single colour, can its switching group be 3-transitive. On the other hand, if m is finite but greater than 2, then $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ can be highly transitive, as it is for example for $\Gamma = \mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$. Whilst $S^*_{m,n}$ is primitive on $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$ if $m > 2$ and $n < \omega$, the group $S^*_{m,\omega}$ for $m > 2$ is not even transitive on the set of all m-coloured graphs, as illustrated by the monochromatic graph example above.

The semidirect product structure of the finite switching groups derived in Theorem 2.19 is retained when we take a countably infinite vertex set, so that $S_{m,\omega} = N \rtimes K$, where N is the normal subgroup of all elements of $S_{m,\omega}$ which induce even permutations of the colours on any edge, and K is an infinite product of copies of C_2. The group N lies strictly between the direct and cartesian products of alternating groups of degree m for $m \geq 3$ colours and K is an elementary abelian 2-group isomorphic to the switching group $S_{2,\omega}$.

Now look at an extended version of the finitary switching groups. We make similar constructions to that of the wreath products of two permutation groups [**107**]. Let $\mathrm{Sym}(V)$, be the 'top group' acting in its induced action on the set E of two-element subsets of the graph vertex set V ($2 \leq |E| = \binom{n}{2} \leq \infty$ for an n-vertex set), and H the 'bottom group' (given by transpositions when it is finite), acting on the colour set $\mathcal{C}_m$ ($2 \leq |\mathcal{C}_m| = m \leq \infty$); that is, H denotes a switching group. The operand is shown in Figure 1.

So $\Omega = \mathcal{C}_m \times E$ is a fibre bundle over the set of edges E, with projection map $(c, e) \mapsto e$; each fibre takes the form $\{(c, e) : c \in \mathcal{C}_m\}$ for fixed $e \in E$ and represents a colour set on an edge. Each of the heavy pairs of points in the diagram represents an edge, a point in a fibre is a



FIGURE 1. Fibre diagram for n–vertex m–coloured graph

coloured edge and a global section (a subset containing one point from each fibre) corresponds to a colouring of the graph.

We would like to go one step further and define a concept of unrestricted switchings for the countably infinite random graph $\mathfrak{R}_{\omega,\omega}$ with a countable infinity of colours, and we denote the group so generated by $S_{\omega,\omega}$. Note that $\bigcup_{m\geq 3} S^f_{m,\omega} < S_{\omega,\omega}$. Let $X \subseteq V$ where V is the vertex set and π be a permutation of $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ with $|m| = \omega$. For subgraph Γ let the switching action be $\sigma_{\pi,X}(\Gamma) = \Gamma'$ where the colour of edge e in graph Γ' is

$$\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma'}(e) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{C}_{\Gamma'}(e)\pi & \text{if edge } e \text{ goes between } X \text{ and } X' \\ \mathcal{C}_{\Gamma}(e) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where X' is the complement of X in Γ. It can be checked straightforwardly that $\bigcup_{m\geq 3} S^f_{m,\omega}$ is obtained by restricting π to be a finitary permutation.

Then define $S_{\omega,\omega} := \langle \sigma_{X,\pi} | X \subseteq V \text{ and } \pi \in \mathrm{Sym}(\mathcal{C}_m), m \subseteq \omega \rangle$. In terms of the above fibre diagram, those fibres representing edges both within and outside X are stabilized by the switching action, whilst for edges between X and its complement X', $c \to c\pi$. We have here a form of subcartesian product of copies of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathcal{C}_m)$ indexed by edges or more properly an extended direct product which in a suitably defined limit of action over all fibres or edges gives a cartesian product. So our product lies strictly between a direct and a cartesian product. A direct product is insufficient because a finite number of switchings is insufficient to describe the switching operation on an infinite colour set. Nor can it be a cartesian product which gives a transitive group action on the relevant function set where $S_{\omega,\omega} \leq \mathrm{Cr}_E \mathrm{Sym}(\mathcal{C}_\omega)$ with the product action, if we identify a coloured graph with a function $E \to \mathcal{C}_\omega$; this would contradict the strict inequality $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma) < \mathrm{Sym}(X)$ for a graph Γ on a vertex set X, from Theorem 2.14. This new type of group product is worthy of study in its own right in order to uncover its properties.

Consider $S_{\omega,\omega} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(V)$ where $|V| = \omega$. Using this group we can set up a wreath-like product under two different actions that are similar (but not identical) to the imprimitive and product actions of a wreath product:

(i) an imprimitive action on the set $\Omega = \mathcal{C}_m \times E$ of coloured edges; these sets are orbits of $S_{\omega,\omega}$ and blocks of imprimitivity of $S_{\omega,\omega} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(V)$, and the orbits are transitive and oligomorphic (see later in the chapter for the definition of a 'parity' that provides the relevant countable first-order structure), and (ii) a product action on the set of all coloured graphs, which can be identified as the set of all functions from E to $\mathcal{C}_m$, or of global sections of the fibred space $\mathcal{C}_m \times E \to E$. This action is not oligomorphic since the number of edges on which two colourings agree is an invariant of pairs. (The group $\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$ is the stabilizer of graph Γ in the wreath product under the product action with Γ identified with a global section of $\Omega = \mathcal{C}_m \times E$).

To describe the imprimitive complete wreath product action let the cartesian product B of $|E|$ copies of the group H, one acting on each fibre as H acts on $\mathcal{C}_m$, be the set of functions from E to H acting pointwise; the action is given by $\mu((c,e),h) = (ch(e),e)$, for $h \in H$, with function $\mu : \Omega \times H \mapsto \Omega$. For $|\mathcal{C}_m|, |E| > 1$, the fibres are blocks of imprimitivity with congruence relation $\sim$ defined by $(c,e) \sim (c',e')$ *iff* $e = e'$. Now let T be a copy of the group $\mathrm{Sym}(V)$ permuting the fibres: $\mu((\gamma,e),k) = (\gamma,ek)$ for $k \in \mathrm{Sym}(V)$. Then T normalizes B, and the semidirect product $G = B \rtimes T$ is a wreath product of permutation groups. We are interested in a subgroup of this wreath product where the full cartesian product of H groups in B is replaced by the switching group acting on only a proper subset of the fibres, although this subset can still be countably infinite.

The group $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n}) \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(V)$ where $m \geq 3$ and $|V| = \omega$ is transitive on coloured edges.

Returning to finitary permutations, assuming the axiom of choice define $\mathcal{S}_\omega := \cup_{m\geq 3} S^f_{m,\omega}$ whose elements induce finitary permutations on the colours of any edge, so $\mathcal{S}_\omega$ also has a semidirect product structure; a union of an ascending sequence of groups is always a group. Another instructive way of writing $\mathcal{S}_\omega$ would be as $S^f_{\omega,\omega}$.

3.1. Proposition. $S_{\omega,\omega} \gneqq \mathcal{S}_\omega$.

This is clear because elements of the right-hand group can only change finitely many colours whereas the other group changes an arbitrarily large number of colours.

Let m be finite. Define another variation on the switching group theme, the *enhanced switching group* by $ES_{m,n} := \mathrm{Cr}_{i=1}^{\omega}(S_{m,n})_{i=1} \rtimes \mathrm{FSym}(V)$, where $|V| = \omega$.

3.2. THEOREM. *$ES_{m,n}$ is locally finite.*

PROOF. This follows from the next two lemmas. □

3.3. LEMMA. *The cartesian power of a fixed finite group is locally finite.*

PROOF. Let I be an infinite index set. Define $\mathrm{Cr}_{i\in I}(H_i) := \{f : I \longrightarrow \bigcup_{i\in I} H_i \mid f(i) \in H_i \ \forall i \in I\}$. If f_1, f_2 are two elements of the cartesian power, the group operation is multiplication of components defined by $(f_1f_2)(i) = f_1(i)f_2(i)$, where the right-hand side is a product in H_i. Take $H_i = H$, a fixed finite group. Take n elements of the cartesian product $f_1, \ldots, f_n$. There exists a partition $I = I_1 \cup I_2 \ldots \cup I_N$ such that all f_i are constant on the components in each I_j. We need to show that there is an embedding $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n\rangle \hookrightarrow H^N$. Define a map $\phi_i : (f_1, \ldots, f_n) \to (f_1(i), \ldots, f_n(i))$ where $\phi_i = \phi_{i'}$ for $i, i' \in I_j$ $(1 \le j \le N)$. Then this is an injection from $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n\rangle$ into H^N which is a finite group. Therefore $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n\rangle$ is a finite group. □

So the group $S_{m,\omega} = \langle \sigma_{c,d,X} | X \subseteq V,\ c, d \in \mathcal{C}_m\rangle (\le \mathrm{Cr}_{i=1}^{\omega}(\mathrm{Sym}(m))_i)$ is locally finite.

3.4. LEMMA. *The class of locally finite groups is extension-closed.*

PROOF. Let $N \lhd G$ and suppose that $N, G/N$ are locally finite. Take $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in G$. Their images under the natural homomorphism $G \to G/N$ generate a finite subgroup. Let $H = \langle g_1, \ldots, g_n\rangle$. The Reidemeister-Schreier algorithm then gives us a finite generating set for $H \cap N$, so $H \cap N$ is finite. Also $N/H \cap N \cong HN/N$ is finite by the first step. So H is finite. □

It then follows that,

3.5. THEOREM. *$\mathcal{S}_\omega \rtimes \mathrm{FSym}(V)$ where $|V| = \omega$ is locally finite.*

PROOF. The class of locally finite groups is subgroup-closed. □

Note however that $S_{\omega,\omega}$ is not locally finite because it contains subgroups that are the product of an infinite number of elements of increasingly high order.

We saw that the full group of switching automorphisms defines a reduct if $m = 2$ but not if $m > 2$. However we also have a proof that switching a specific pair of colours defines a reduct for $m > 2$. It is probably true that the group of switching automorphisms involving a specific proper subset of the colours always defines a reduct.

2. Parity Equivalence of Coloured Graphs

In this section we continue to uncover further properties of switching groups with finitely many colours. It will transpire that the finitary switching groups are closed in a sense that we will elucidate.

We differentiate between the group $S_{m,\omega} = \langle \sigma_{c,d,X} : X \subseteq V, |V| = \omega, c, d \in \mathcal{C}_m \rangle$ that is generated by switchings, and the group that is its closure in its action on the space $\mathcal{C}_m \times \binom{\omega}{2}$ of coloured edges, which we denote $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$. We will give a description of $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ as a closed permutation group whereby its elements act so as to preserve a parity condition.

First we observe a topological property of those switching groups $S_{m,n}$ for finite m in the $n \to \omega$ limit – that $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ is a *profinite group*, that is a compact totally disconnected topological group. A metric space is *connected* if it cannot be expressed as a union of two disjoint, nonempty subsets that are open in its induced topology. A space is *totally disconnected* if each of its components contains only a single point, which means that it has separation property T_1, that is, every point is closed; more on this concept in Chapter 8. The groups in question are compact, being both closed and having only finite orbits [**97**] in an imprimitive action to be defined below, and so can be interpreted as profinite groups, that is inverse limits of inverse systems of finite groups. For each colour set the inverse system is the sequence

$$\ldots \to S_{m,n} \to S_{m,n-1} \to \ldots \to S_{m,\bar{n}}$$

together with epimorphisms $\phi_{n,\bar{n}} : S_{m,n} \to S_{m,\bar{n}}$ (for $\bar{n} \leq n$) such that $\phi_{a,b}\phi_{b,c} = \phi_{a,c}$ whenever $c \leq b \leq a$. The maps are restriction homomorphisms regarding colourings of $K_{\bar{n}}$ as restrictions of colourings of K_n.

The *inverse limit* of the sequence is a universal topological group G whose elements are all sequences $(g_n : n \in \omega)$ with $g_n \in S_{m,n}$ such that $g_n\phi_{n,\bar{n}} = g_{\bar{n}}$ for $\bar{n} \leq n$, with group composition being coordinatewise multiplication together with the homomorphisms θ_n such that $\theta_n\phi_{n,\bar{n}} = \theta_{\bar{n}}$, that is θ_n acts as projection onto the nth coordinate, $\theta_n : G \to S_{m,n}$. So G induces the finite groups $S_{m,n}$. It is possible that the group $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ also has non-profinite proper subgroups but we do not concider these.

All profinite groups are homomorphic images of some closed oligomorphic permutation group with some prescribed degree of transitivity [**207**]. There are several equivalences [**543**] [**555**, p. 19] to a topological group being profinite, two of which are:

(i) $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ is isomorphic (as a topological group) to a closed subgroup of a Cartesian product of finite groups.

We can illustrate how the group $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ is closed in a countably infinite cartesian product of finite symmetric groups, $S^{cl}_{m,\omega} \leq \mathrm{Cr}^{\omega}_{i=1}(\mathrm{Sym}(m))_i$. Observing that the closure of the union of direct products $\mathrm{Dr}_{i<\infty}(G)_i$ is equal to the cartesian product $\mathrm{Cr}^{\infty}_{j=1}(G)_j$ for a finite group G, we define $N := S^{cl}_{m,\omega} \cap \mathrm{Cr}^{\omega}_{i=1}(\mathrm{Alt}(m))_i$. Clearly $N \lhd S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ and the quotient $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}/N$ is isomorphic to the elementary abelian two-group C^{ω}_2. Now there exists a subgroup S' of index 2 in $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ containing N such that S' induces $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ on each edge or fibre. Note that there are uncountably many subgroups of index 2, but only countably many fail to induce $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ on some fibre. We can choose S' to contain the stabilizer $S^{cl}_{m,\omega,(e_1,\ldots,e_r)}$ of the colours of a finite tuple of edges $e_1, \ldots, e_r$. Project onto the subgroup of $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}/N$ which is trivial in coordinates $1, \ldots, r$, so that $S' \geq S^{cl}_{m,\omega,(e_1,\ldots,e_r)}$. So S' has index 2 in $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ and is open because it contains the pointwise stabilizer of a finite set.

(ii) $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ is compact and $\bigcap(N|N \lhd_O S^{cl}_{m,\omega}) = 1$, where $\lhd_O$ denotes an open normal subgroup.

We can illustrate this by taking for N a sequence of fibrewise stabilizers of an increasing number of fibres, whose intersection is then trivial.

There are also various subgroup properties [**555**, p. 36] such as,

(i) $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ has Sylow p-subgroups for some prime p,

(ii) Any two Sylow p-subgroups are conjugate in $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$, that is $\exists g \in S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ such that $g^{-1}P_1 g = P_2$.

There is a second equivalent description of $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$, which explains the connection between profinite groups and groups with finite orbits via an equivalence of topologies.

The switching group $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ is a closed subgroup of the cartesian product of symmetric groups of degree $m \geq 3$, in the topology defined by the imprimitive action for the cartesian product where each fibre comprises the colour set $\mathcal{C}_m = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ of an edge. It is possible to firstly show that on each fibre we have a convergent sequence of switchings using the idea of pointwise convergence: the distance $d(f, g)$ between two distinct automorphisms f and g,

$$d(f, g) := 2^{-(min(n):f(n)\neq g(n) \ or \ f(n)^{-1}\neq g(n)^{-1})}$$

defines the topology of pointwise convergence. Then we can show that there is a convergence on a cartesian product of the fibres. By identifying the topology of pointwise convergence with the profinite topology we can prove convergence of products of switchings on the cartesian product of fibres.

A profinite group having a countable base of open subgroups (or equivalently a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ with all orbits finite), is topologically isomorphic to the factor group of an automorphism group of an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure by a closed normal subgroup Φ [**207**, Lemma 3.1]. Furthermore, Φ can be chosen to be oligomorphic and having no proper closed subgroups of finite index.

Recall that the topology of pointwise convergence refers to the limit of a sequence of permutations on operand X converging thus: $\lim_{n\to\infty}(g_n) = g$ if and only if $\forall x_i \in X,\ \exists n_0 \in \omega$ such that $\forall n > n_0,\ x_i g_n = x_i g$. A basis of open neighbourhoods of the identity consists of the pointwise stabilizers of all finite sets. But $S_{m,n} < \mathrm{Sym}(m)$ and the topology of pointwise convergence on $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$, where $\mathcal{C}_m$ has the discrete topology, is Hausdorff, so we have closure and convergence of switchings on each fibre. Now we identify the topology of pointwise convergence (for some n_0 as above) with the profinite topology of product switchings on the n_0 vertices. This is done by taking the inverse system with all epimorphisms $\phi_{n_0,n} : S_{m,n_0} \to S_{m,n}$ $(\forall\ 1 \le n < n_0)$ such that $\phi_{n_0,n_1}\phi_{n_1,n_2} = \phi_{n_0,n_2}$ whenever $n_2 \le n_1 \le n_0$.

We omit the details but the conclusion is that there is convergence in the profinite topology of product switchings induced from the discrete topology on each $S_{m,n}$. The switching group $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ is an elementary type of profinite group, that is one contained in a cartesian product of finite groups.

Automorphism groups of countably infinite structures $\mathcal{M}$ are Polish groups [**111**], that is, complete separable metric spaces whose underlying topology turns the group into a topological group. The topology of pointwise convergence turns $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ into a complete metric space. The group $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ is a Polish group because it is compact and so complete.

A third equivalent description of $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ is as a group with commutator subgroup $\mathrm{Cr}^{\infty}_{i=1}(\mathrm{Alt}(m))_i$.

We now derive a parity condition which acts as an invariant relation for the action of $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ on 3-vertex subsets of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$.

Consider three vertices x, y, z in a *complete multicoloured graph* and m possible colours on the corresponding edges xy, xz, yz, so that we have an m-layered fibre diagram as in Figure 2. Any switching changes the colours of an even number of edges. It also preserves an analogue of a two-graph, namely, the parity of the permutation of the colours on any 3-set of vertices with edges coloured from $\mathcal{C}_m = \{c_1, \ldots, c_m\}$. Let P_m be a $3m$-place relation which holds only if there exist vertex triples x, y, z such that the first m arguments form the fibre above xy (in some order), the second m form the fibre above xz, and the last



FIGURE 2. Fibre diagram for $\mathfrak{R}_{m,3}$

m form the fibre above yz, and if g_{xy}, g_{xz}, and g_{yz} are the permutations describing the order of these arguments, then $g_{xy}g_{xz}g_{yz}$ is an even permutation. The element g_{xy} maps the colour c_i on edge $\{x, y\}$ to the ith argument of P_m. For example taking $m = 3$, c_{12} to mean the colour on edges $\{1, 2\}$ and $(c_{12}, c_{13}, c_{23}) = (\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$, the permutation $(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}) \to (\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{r}) \to (\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{r}) \in \mathsf{P_m}$. Notice that the definition of parity depends on the sequential composition of the individual colour changes on the edges, for if we were instead to take the following definition of composition: $(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}) \to (\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{r})$ which is an odd permutation followed by $(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}) \to (\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{r})$ which is an even permutation, then composing these parities multiplicatively gives a product of permutations having odd parity.

We call two complete m-coloured graphs Γ_1 and Γ_2 on any vertex set P_m-*equivalent* if each triple of vertices of Γ_2 is a parity preserving permutation of the colours of the corresponding vertex triple of Γ_1.

3.6. LEMMA. *P_m is preserved by any switching $\sigma_{c,d,X}$.*

PROOF. Obvious if $X \cap \{x, y, z\} = \varnothing$ or $\{x, y, z\}$. If $X \cap \{x, y, z\} = \{x\}$ then $\sigma_{c,d,X}$ transposes colours c and d on edges xy and xz and fixes colours on yz. So the parity of the product is unchanged. □

3.7. THEOREM. *The elements of $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ are precisely the permutations which fix all the fibres and preserve P_m.*

PROOF. Switching does not change the P_m parity of the edges within a 3-set and as this is true for all 3-sets so switching-equivalent graphs are P_m-equivalent.

For the converse we need to show that a P_m-preserving permutation of edge colours is always achievable by a product of elements of

$S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$. We must first consider the vertex-permutation induced by a P_m-preserving permutation of the whole graph and then show that this is achievable as a product of switching automorphisms.

But as we have seen in the previous chapter, the group of switching automorphisms is highly transitive so its closure is the symmetric group. So we can always undo a parity-preserving permutation by an element within $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$, modulo a permutation of the elements of a fibre on each edge. This can then be done one fibre at a time and then the limit can be taken, which lies within the wreath product $\lim_{X\to\infty} \mathrm{Sym}(\mathcal{C}_m) \,\mathrm{Wr}\, \mathrm{Sym}(X)$.

Now we deal with the permutation of colours/fibres on each edge. There are $m!$ such permutations. On a particular edge, we can permute the colours so as to preserve P_m. Working on more and more edges, we can switch to ensure that the fibres above an edge are left invariant after a sufficient point. This will apply to an increasing number of edges. Then pointwise convergence makes the limiting process work. □

It now follows that the group $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ is the automorphism group of an equivalence relation whose classes are fibres on an edge together with the first-order $3m$-ary relation P_m. In the next chapter we give a slight extension of this result from complete graphs to more general graphs.

To recap, we have introduced two different notions of parity of colours on random graph edges, but we note that a comparison of these is not straightforward as they seem to be somewhat different entities.

Firstly in Chapter 2 we defined two complete 3-coloured graphs to be *P-equivalent* if they have the same red edges and each blue-green triangle has the same parity of the number of green edges. This is a *global* concept used to compare two graphs, or two global sections of a fibre diagram, where each fibre represents the different colours on a specific edge.

Then in this section, we defined two complete m-coloured graphs on any vertex set to be P_m-*equivalent* if each triple of vertices of one graph is a parity preserving permutation of the colours of the corresponding vertex triple of the other graph. Consideration of triples of vertices at a time makes this a *local* concept.

From our discussion in Chapter 2, P-equivalence is a weaker condition that S-equivalence in general, and by Theorem 2.7, as the vertex set $n \to \infty$, the two become asymptotically equivalent in an appropriate set of measure 1, and they coincide for $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathrm{t}}$.

This, together with Theorem 3.7, appear to indicate that $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ is strictly an overgroup of $S_{m,\omega}$, and that the example we gave in our discussion of P-equivalence in Chapter 2 belongs to $S^{cl}_{m,\omega} \backslash S_{m,\omega}$.

Any switching which stabilises the blue-green parity (in triangles) but changes the red edges is another example.

Open Question Find an example of a graph for which $S_{m,\omega}$ is not closed.

We began the section by showing how to form an inverse limit of switching groups, and we end by showing how they can form a direct limit. Fix the number of colours $|\mathcal{C}_m| = m$. Let S_n be the group of switchings on $\mathfrak{R}_{m,n}$; any element of this group is the product of elementary switchings about a single vertex which we can denote $\sigma_{c,d,v}$. We can extend S_n to act on $\mathfrak{R}_{m,n+1}$. Denote by $\sigma^{(n)}_{c,d,v}$ the switching of colours c and d about $v \in \{1,\dots,n\}$. The map $\alpha^{n+1}_n : \sigma^{(n)}_{c,d,v} \mapsto \sigma^{(n+1)}_{c,d,v}$ is an injection from S_n to S_{n+1}. The map $\pi^{n+1}_n : \mathsf{S}_{n+1} \to \mathsf{S}_n : \sigma^{(n+1)}_{c,d,v} \mapsto \sigma^{(n)}_{c,d,v}$ is an epimorphism since we can define

$$\sigma^{(n+1)}_{c,d,v} \in \mathsf{S}_{n+1} \to \begin{cases} \sigma^{(n)}_{c,d,v} \in \mathsf{S}_n & \text{if } v \in \{1,\dots,n\} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sigma^{(n+1)}_{c,d,v}\sigma^{(n+1)}_{k,l,w} \in \mathsf{S}_{n+1} \to \begin{cases} \sigma^{(n)}_{c,d,v}\sigma^{(n)}_{k,l,w} \in \mathsf{S}_n & \text{if } v,w \in \{1,\dots,n\} \\ 1 & \text{if } v,w \notin \{1,\dots,n\} \\ \sigma^{(n)}_{c,d,v} \in \mathsf{S}_n & \text{if } v \in \{1,\dots,n\}, \\ & \text{and } w \notin \{1,\dots,n\}. \end{cases}$$

Therefore there are homomorphisms both ways

$$\mathsf{S}_n \underset{\pi_n}{\overset{\iota_{n+1}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathsf{S}_{n+1}$$

where $\ker(\pi_n) \lhd \mathsf{S}_{n+1}$ is a normal complement to $\mathrm{im}(\iota_{n+1})$, and also $\ker(\pi_n) \cap \mathrm{im}(\iota_{n+1}) = 1$. The group S_n acts on the points above edges in $\{1,\dots,n\}$, that is on coloured edges from this set. So $\mathsf{S}_{n+1} \to \mathsf{S}_n$ is the restriction map, and its kernel consists of switchings fixing all coloured edges within $\{1,\dots,n\}$. The image map permutes the colours on the edges beween the $(n+1)$st vertex and the other n vertices.

Now we can define a direct system of groups comprising a family $(\mathsf{S}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and homomorphisms $\alpha^{n_2}_{n_1} : \mathsf{S}_{n_1} \mapsto \mathsf{S}_{n_2}$ where $n_1 \le n_2$, satisfying (i) $\alpha^{n_1}_{n_1}$ is the identity on S_{n_1}, (ii) $\alpha^{n_3}_{n_1} = \alpha^{n_2}_{n_1}\alpha^{n_3}_{n_2}$ whenever $n_1 \le n_2 \le n_3$. We can define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on the set-theoretic union $\mathsf{S} = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathsf{S}_n$, defining $\sigma_{n_1} \sim \bar{\sigma}_{n_2}$ if there exists $n_3 \ge n_1, n_2$ such that $\alpha^{n_3}_{n_1}(\sigma_{n_1}) = \alpha^{n_3}_{n_2}(\bar{\sigma}_{n_2})$, that is the images are equal. Let $\bar{\mathsf{S}}_n$ be the image

of the monomorphism $\theta_n : \mathsf{S}_n \to \mathsf{S}_D$ in $\mathsf{S}_D = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathsf{S}_n$. Now convert the set $\mathcal{S}_D$ of all equivalence classes $[\sigma_n] \in \bar{\mathsf{S}}_n$ of $\sigma_n \in \mathsf{S}_n$ into a group by defining the product $[\sigma_{n_1}][\sigma_{n_2}] = [\alpha_{n_1}^{n_3}(\sigma_{n_1})\alpha_{n_2}^{n_3}(\sigma_{n_2})] = [\alpha_{n_1}^{n_3}(\bar{\sigma}_{n_1})\alpha_{n_2}^{n_3}(\bar{\sigma}_{n_2})]$ and $1_D = [1_{\mathsf{S}_n}]$, and $[\sigma_n]^{-1} = [\sigma_n^{-1}]$. Then $\{\mathsf{S}_D,\ \theta_n\}$ is the *direct limit* of the direct system.

It is not always the case that inverse and direct limits of homomorphisms accompany each other. For example, whilst there is a direct limit of symmetric groups, this being the finitary symmetric group, there are no inverse homomorphisms. Where they do both exist, as is the case for the switching group limits as defined in this section, the direct colimit and inverse limit are categorically dual to each other, though this case is perhaps not so interesting from a category theory point of view.

CHAPTER 4

Local Switchings & Group Presentations

All the mathematical sciences are founded on relations between physical laws and laws of numbers, so that the aim of exact science is to reduce the problems of nature to the determination of quantities by operations with numbers.

James Clerk Maxwell, *On Faraday's Lines of Force, 1856*

1. Local Switching of Simple Graphs

In this section we give a synopsis of the theory of *local switching* and its connection to signed graphs, root lattices and Coxeter groups as expounded by Cameron, Seidel and Tsaranov in [**123**] for two-colour graphs. In the next section we begin to extend this theory to multi-coloured graphs.

A *signed graph* (Γ, f) is a graph Γ with a signing $f : E(\Gamma) \to \{+1, -1\}$ on the edges.

Given a signing f of the edge-set of Γ, the signing f_X obtained from f by reversing the sign of each edge which has one vertex in a subset $X \subseteq V(\Gamma)$ of the vertex set, then this defines on the set of signings an equivalence relation, called *switching*, since

$$f_\varnothing = f, \qquad (f_X)_X = f, \qquad \text{and} \qquad (f_X)_Y = f_{X \triangle Y}.$$

The *signed switching classes* of Γ are given by the equivalence classes $\{f_X : X \subseteq V\}$.

Observe firstly that the collection of "odd" signed cycles (those with an odd number of + signs) is invariant under switching. Further observe that all signings of a tree are equivalent, because from any source we can inductively switch all signs into +1.

Signed graphs can be used to define root lattices $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$, Weyl $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$, Coxeter $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma, f)$, and Tsaranov $\mathrm{Ts}(\Gamma)$ groups.

The ordinary Coxeter group $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$ on a graph Γ has a generator for each vertex of Γ and product relations of order 3 or 2 corresponding respectively to adjacent or non-adjacent vertices. Its factor group $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma, f)$, the Coxeter group of the signed graph (Γ, f) is obtained

by adding one relation r_C for each odd signed cycle C (whose edges carry an odd number of + signs) in (Γ, f), where for each induced cycle $r_C = \{x_1x_2\dots x_{n-1}x_nx_{n-1}\dots x_2\}^2$ of the Coxeter group $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$. The term r_C is called the *cut element* for an induced cycle C in Γ. Note that the relator r_C is unchanged (as an element in $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$) if we either start the cycle at a different point or if we go round the cycle in the other direction. That is $\{x_1x_2\dots x_{n-1}x_nx_{n-1}\dots x_2\}^2 = 1$ in $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma) \Leftrightarrow \{x_2x_3\dots x_nx_1x_n\dots x_3\}^2 = 1$ in $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma) \Leftrightarrow \{x_1x_n\dots x_3x_2x_3\dots x_n\}^2 = 1$ in $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$; to get from the first expression to the third, move x_1 from the front to the end and this is equivalent to reversing the cycle, since in Coxeter groups $x_ix_i^{-1} = 1$ and $(x_1\dots x_n) = (x_n\dots x_1)^{-1}$. Written in terms of the set $\mathcal{C}_f$ of induced odd cycles of (Γ, f),

$$\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma, f) = \mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)/\langle r_C : C \in \mathcal{C}_f\rangle^{\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)}.$$

The *Witt representation* of $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$ is defined as follows. Let Γ have $(1,0)$-*adjacency matrix* A, and let $\mathbb{L}$ be the lattice having a basis $(e_1,\dots,e_n)$ with Gram matrix $2I - A$ (this is the *intersection matrix* of the − signing of Γ; see below). The Weyl group $\mathrm{W}(\mathbb{L})$ is generated by the reflections w_i in the hyperplanes perpendicular to e_i, for $i = 1,\dots,n$.

That $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma, f)$ is invariant under switching, that is, the relation corresponding to an odd cycle is changed to an equivalent relation modulo $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$ on switching, follows because switching preserves odd cycles and graphs.

4.1. Theorem. *If f is any signing of the graph Γ then the map $x_i \mapsto w_i$, $i = 1,\dots,n$, induces a homomorphism $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$ whose kernel contains the cut elements r_C for all odd cycles C. So $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$ is a homomorphic image of $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma, f)$.*

Proof. To show that $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f) : x_i \mapsto w_i$ is a homomorphism, we must show that w_i satisfy the defining relations of the Coxeter group. Firstly note that w_i has order 2. If $i \sim j$, then $(e_i, e_j) = \pm 1$, and so the roots are at an angle $\pi/3$ or $2\pi/3$; so w_iw_j is a rotation through the doubled angle $2\pi/3$ or $4\pi/3$, and has order 3. Similarly if $i \nsim j$ then w_iw_j has order 2.

Consideration of the Weyl groups of odd cycles ([**123**, §3]) then leads to the fact that the image of r_C is the identity under the homomorphism. □

So $\mathrm{im}(r_C) = 1$.

Let E be the adjacency matrix of any connected signed graph (Γ, f). The *intersection matrix* $2I+E$ of (Γ, f) is a symmetric $n\times n$ matrix with entries 2 on the diagonal and $0, +1, -1$ elsewhere. It can be interpreted as the Gram matrix of a root basis of the lattice $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ (whose entries

are the inner product of n basis vectors). That is, as the Gram matrix of the inner products of the basis vectors $e_1, \ldots, e_n$ of real n-space. These vectors are roots having length $\sqrt{2}$ at angles $\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{3}$ or $\frac{2\pi}{3}$. Then $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ is the *root lattice*, an even integral lattice spanned by vectors of norm 2.

Signed graphs with only the signing "−" are called *fundamental*, because they correspond to fundamental bases for Coxeter groups. If the graph Γ has the fundamental signing −, then there are no odd cycles, and the homomorphism of the last theorem induces the isomorphism $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$ to $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma) : x_i \mapsto w_i$. So we observe that $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma, -) = \mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$ where − is the all-negative signing.

If Γ is a tree, then $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma, f) = \mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$ for any f, since all signings are equivalent to the fundamental signing "$-$", and $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma, f) = \mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$, that is signed graphs correspond to fundamental bases for Coxeter groups. For a cycle, there are just two switching classes, and so just two Coxeter groups, $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$ (the Coxeter group of type $\tilde{A}_{n-1}$) and the quotient $2^{n-1} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$.

The determinant and signature of $2I + E$ are invariants. If (Γ, f) is a signed complete graph, then its switching class is equivalent to a two-graph. Any such (K_n, f) gives the ±1 adjacency matrix of a graph γ, and gives a Tsaranov group $\mathrm{Ts}(\gamma)$ which will be defined later. We will say more about this special case at the end of the section.

Local switching, which we also define below, is a symmetric but not transitive relation on the set Ω_n of switching classes of signed graphs on n vertices. Its transitive closure partitions Ω_n into clusters of connected classes, which can be used to classify the lattices and groups. Local switching leaves the root lattice and Weyl group invariant, but does not in general leave $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma, f)$ invariant (though it does so in the positive definite case). Local switching has combinatorial, geometric and algebraic interpretations respectively for signed graphs, root lattices and Weyl groups. In the positive definite case, local switching is equivalent to the Gabrielov transformation in singularity theory [**230**].

Signed graphs arise all over mathematics. T. Zaslavsky [**562**] has used them to study line graphs of finite loopless two-colour graphs. It is instructive to recall one set of related results. In this application, Cameron has expressed generalizations of Mallows and Sloane's result [**381**] on two-graphs (see Chapter 2) who treat the case of a complete underlying graph. This was further extended by Wells [**548**] who introduced the notion of *even signings* as a generalization of even

graphs and signed switching classes which generalize ordinary switching classes.

A signing f of a signed graph (Γ, f) is *even* if each vertex is incident with an even number of edges signed " − ". Wells shows that the number of isomorphism types of even signings of a fixed simple graph Γ equals the number of isomorphism types of signed switching classes of Γ. He derives a formula for the number of these isomorphism types, and in addition, he finds a criterion for determining whether all signed switching classes fixed by a graph automorphism α actually contain signings fixed by α.

Cameron used cohomological algebra [**79**] to explain properties of switching classes and two-graphs, and Cameron and Wells used it [**130**] to develop a theory of signings, signed switching classes and signatures, treating these as elements of certain distinguished vector spaces over $K = \{0, 1\}$, where the operations of switching and forming signatures are linear transformations on these binary vector spaces. The binary vector spaces are of the form $V_i = \mathbb{F}_2^{X_i}$, where $X_{-1} = \{\varnothing\}$, X_0 denotes the set of vertices, X_1 denotes the set of edges (including vertices), and X_2 and X_3 are arbitrary sets of subgraphs. The conditions to get a *cochain complex* are to take X_2 as some cycles C of the graph having all valencies even, whilst the edge of an X_3-graph should be in an even number of X_2-subgraphs. Let V_i be the binary vector space of formal sums of elements of X_i. If $0 \le i \le 3$ define boundary maps $\partial_i : V_i \to V_{i-1}$ by taking the linear extension of the function mapping X_i-elements to the sum of its subgraphs in X_{i-1}.

Via coboundary maps δ^i this leads to the *complex* sequence for dual vector spaces as in Figure 1

$$V^{-1} \xrightarrow{\delta^{-1}} V^0 \xrightarrow{\delta^0} V^{-1} \xrightarrow{\delta^1} V^1 \xrightarrow{\delta^2} V^3$$

FIGURE 1. The Complex when conditions $\delta^i\delta^{i+1} = 0$ are satisfied for $-1 \le i \le 1$.

For $f \in V_0$ and $\{v, w\} \in X_1$, $\delta f(\{v, w\}) = f(w) - f(v) = f(w) + f(v)$, where the last equality follow as we are working mod 2. For $f \in V_1$ and $C \in X_2$, $\delta f(C) = \sum_{e \in C} f(e)$.

Furthermore, $\delta^2 f(C) = \sum_{e \in C} \delta f(e) = 0$ if each v is on 2 edges of C. Also if $f \in V_1$ then $\delta^2 f(S) = \sum_{C \in S} \delta f(e) = 0$ if each edge is on 2 faces of $S \in X_3$. So the even valency conditions on X_2 and X_3 are required to ensure $\delta^2 = 0$.

Then if $(\Gamma; X_2, X_3)$ is a complex, it is possible to define binary vector spaces $H^i = \ker(\delta^i)/\operatorname{im}(\delta^{i-1})$, $0 \le i \le 2$. The complex $(\Gamma; X_2, X_3)$ is

called *exact* when all three binary vector spaces H^0, H^1 and H^2 vanish. Cameron and Wells show that a sequence of dual binary vector spaces is exact precisely when the analogues of properties of switching-classes and two-graphs are satisfied, as encapsulated in,

4.2. THEOREM. *$(\Gamma; X_2, X_3)$ is exact if and only if all three of the following statements hold for all $X, Y \subseteq V(\Gamma)$, all $f, f_1, f_2 \in V'$ (where the elements of V' correspond to signings of Γ), and $S \subseteq X_2$:*

(i) $f_X = f_Y$ if and only if $X = Y$ or $X = V(\Gamma) \backslash Y$;

(ii) f_1 and f_2 are switching equivalent if and only if they have the same signature relative to X_2;

(iii) A subset S of X_2 is a signature if and only if each member of X_3 has an even number of elements of S as subgraphs.

Zaslavsky has studied [**561**] generalized two-graphs called *togs*, structures consisting of sets of polygons or cycles in a graph that satisfy relations that make them equivalent to switching classes of signings of a particular base graph.

Further references to related studies of switching by Seidel and Taylor are [**483**] [**515**] and [**516**].

The *adjacency matrix* $E = E(\Gamma, f)$ has entries

$$E_{ij} = \begin{cases} f(i,j) & \text{for } \{i,j\} \in E \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Switching with respect to $X \subseteq V$ induces the transformation $E \to DED$, where D is the diagonal matrix with -1 (respectively $+1$) at the positions of X (respectively $V \backslash X$). The eigenvalues of E and of DED are the same and are called the *spectrum* of the signed switching class.

As we have already noted, a tree has only one switching class because we can inductively switch all signs to -1, and a *signed cycle* has two switching classes. The *parity* of a signed cycle is the parity of the number of its edges which carry a *positive* sign. The *balance* of a signed cycle, cf. [**270**] is the product of the signs on its edges. If $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of induced cycles (those paths having no chords in the graph) in (Γ, f), then in obvious notation $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^+ \cup \mathcal{C}^-$ (where $b = \pm$ is the balance). Both parity and balance are switching class invariants. For example, two signings of a connected graph are switching equivalent if and only if they have the same balance; equivalently stated, the space of cycles and cocycles are complementary [**130**]. For signed complete graphs this reduces to the bijection between switching classes and two-graphs.

The *root lattices* $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ are formed from integral linear combinations of length $\sqrt{2}$ vectors (roots) which are at angles $\pi/2, \pi/3$ or $2\pi/3$.

Their Weyl groups $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$ are generated by the reflections w_i in the hyperplanes orthogonal to the roots e_i, where

$$w_i(x) = x - \frac{2(e_i, x)}{(e_i, e_i)} e_i = x - (x, e_i) e_i.$$

We review some salient points of this theory. Assume that Γ is connected.

Switching (Γ, f) maps $e_i \to -e_i$, so leaves $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ and $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$ invariant.

The group $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$ is finite if and only if $2I + E$ is positive definite. Then the root system is finite and Γ is one of the *spherical Coxeter-Dynkin diagrams* A_n, D_n, E_6, E_7, E_8, corresponding to integral bases of Euclidean $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ of type A, D, E. (Were Γ to be disconnected, then it would be the direct sum of copies of these diagrams). For if $2I + E$ is positive definite then the orthogonal group that it defines is compact, and its discrete subgroup $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$ is finite. If Γ is a tree, $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$ is signing-independent so we write $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma)$. The origin of the word spherical is that the Coxeter group $\mathrm{Cox}(\Xi)$ of a graph Ξ in the so-called *spherical case* is represented as a reflection group in spherical space. As a footnote, we mention that at the heart of the ubiquity of the Coxeter-Dynkin diagram ADE-classification given by the Coxeter-Dynkin diagrams, appears to be the ambiguity as to whether they describe either 3-dimensional rotation groups and singularities (so that E_6, E_7, and E_8 represent the tetrahedron, octahedron and icosahedron), or root systems in higher dimensions (so that these three diagrams represent objects in Euclidean spaces of dimension 6, 7 and 8).

The extended Coxeter-Dynkin graphs of $\tilde{D}_n, \tilde{E}_6, \tilde{E}_7, \tilde{E}_8$ are trees, but $\tilde{A}_n$ is a cycle with $n + 1$ vertices, with $\mathrm{W}(A_n) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(n + 1)$, and $\mathrm{W}(\tilde{A}_n) \cong \mathbb{Z}^n \rtimes \mathrm{W}(A_n)$. Here $\mathbb{Z}^n$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{L}(A_n)$ and the action of the quotient group by conjugation agrees with its natural action on the lattice. Root lattices whose bases correspond to signed graphs with semi-definite or indefinite intersection matrices have infinite Weyl groups. Any connected signed graph with positive semi-definite intersection matrix is embeddable in a signed graph corresponding to a spherical root system.

We say that $2I + E$ (or the signed graph) has *standard signature* if the signs of its eigenvalues are $\epsilon + + \ldots +$, where $\epsilon \in \{+, -, 0\}$. If the intersection matrix of a signed graph (Γ, f) has standard signature, then the root lattice $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ has a fundamental basis. (The intersection matrix of Slodowy's IM Lie algebra [**496**] is related to the Cartan

matrix of a Kac-Moody algebra by the maps $-1 \to \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $+1 \to \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.)

Signed graphs may be considered to be global as compared to lattices which are local, because a signed graph corresponds to a particular root basis for the lattice; other signed graphs can give rise to the same lattice. The localization of switching so as to relate signed graphs giving the same lattice motivated the following concept:-

The *local graph* of (Γ, f) at vertex i has the set $N(i)$ of neighbours of i as its vertex set, and as edges all edges $\{j,k\}$ of Γ for which $f(i,j)f(j,k)f(k,i) = -1$. A *rim* of (Γ, f) at i is any union of connected components of the local graph at i.

Let J be any rim at i, and let $K = N(i)\backslash J$. The following defines *local switching* of (Γ, f) with respect to (i, J):

(i) delete all edges of Γ between J and K; (any such edge $\{j,k\}$ satisfies $f(i,j)f(j,k)f(k,i) = +1$);

(ii) $\forall j \in J, k \in K$ such that $j \nsim k$, introduce an edge $\{j,k\}$ with sign chosen so that $f(i,j)f(j,k)f(k,i) = -1$;

(iii) change the signs of all edges from i to J;

(iv) leave all other edges and signs unaltered.

Let $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ be the root lattice corresponding to the signed graph (Γ, f), and let J be the rim at a vertex $i \in \Gamma$. Local switching with respect to (i, J) is the transformation $\prod_{j\in J} \sigma_{ij}$ of the root basis of $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ corresponding to (Γ, f), where if $w_i \in \mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$ then

$$\sigma_{ij} : (e_1, \ldots, e_j, \ldots, e_n) \mapsto (e_1, \ldots, w_i(e_j), \ldots, e_n).$$

Let J be a rim at a vertex i. The Weyl group $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$ is local switching invariant. There are two equivalence relations associated with local switching on the class of signed graphs:

(i) at a vertex i, leaving the local graph at i fixed,

(ii) the transitive closure of local switchings at a sequence of different vertices.

The equivalence classes of the transitive closure of the symmetric but not transitive relation on the set Ω_n of switching classes of n-vertex signed graphs, are called *clusters* of order n. Local switching preserves lattice invariants, such as the determinant and signature of $2I + E$. If (Γ, f) and (Γ', f') are connected signed graphs such that the eigenvalues of $E(\Gamma, f)$ are greater than -2, then one can be locally switched into the other if and only if $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ and $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma', f')$ have the same dimension *and* type.

The braid group $B_n = \langle b_i \rangle$ acts on the set $\mathcal{B}$ of ordered root bases:

$$b_i : (e_1, \dots, e_i, e_{i+1}, \dots, e_n) \mapsto (e_1, \dots, e_{i+1}, w_{i+1}(e_i), \dots, e_n).$$

A *quasi-Coxeter element* $w = w_1 \dots w_n \in \mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$ is associated with $(e_1, \dots, e_n) \in \mathcal{B}$. The element of $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$ corresponding to $b_i(e_1, \dots, e_n)$ is $w_1 \dots w_{i-1} w_{i+1} w_i^{w_{i+1}} \dots w_n = w$. The quasi-Coxeter element corresponding to a basis is constant on the orbits of B_n, for all root lattices. In the positive definite $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ case, the converse holds and $(e_1, \dots, e_n) \mapsto (w_1 \dots w_n)$ is a bijection between the set of B_n orbits on $\mathcal{B}$ and the set of quasi-Coxeter elements of $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$.

If $\mathbb{L}$ is positive semi-definite, then $\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f) = W_0 \rtimes \mathbb{L}'$, where the abelian subgroup $W_0 \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-d} (\mathbb{L}')_i$, $\mathbb{L}'$ is a positive definite root lattice with Weyl group W', and the kernel of $\mathbb{L}$ has codimension d. Here W_0 is free abelian of rank $d(n-d)$ and W' has type A_d, D_d or E_d. However if $n - d > 1$ then the homomorphism from $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f) : x_i \to w_i, (i = 1, \dots, n)$, whose kernel contains the elements r_C for all odd cycles C, is not necessarily faithful.

Let $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ and $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma', f')$ be equivalent under local switching, and suppose that $2I + E(\Gamma, f)$ is positive definite. Then the following isomorphisms are true $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma, f) \cong \mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma', f') \cong \mathrm{Cox}(\Xi)$, for some Coxeter-Dynkin graph Ξ. Note that positive definite means that in (Γ, f) and (Γ', f'), all signed cycles have odd parity. Also that any local switching is a composition of 'elementary' local switchings, that is those having rims of order 1.

Signed Complete Graphs (K_n, f).

Switching of signed complete graphs corresponds to Seidel switching of graphs. Off-diagonal entries of E are either -1 (adjacency) or $+1$ (non-adjacency) in Γ. In a complete graph the only induced cycles are the triangles.

Signed complete n-vertex graphs corresponding to ordinary graphs Γ can be lifted to signed graphs $(\overline{\Gamma + 0}, +)$ on $n + 1$ vertices, where the bar denotes complementation.

The signed graph denoted $(\overline{\Gamma + 0}, +)$, has $\Gamma + 0$ as the disjoint union of Γ and an isolated vertex 0. The connected graph $(\overline{\Gamma + 0})$ yields a root lattice $\mathbb{L}(\overline{\Gamma + 0}, +)$. Any signed complete graph can be represented as a bundle of stars (through any one root) in a root system.

Tsaranov Groups

For an n-vertex graph Γ, the *Tsaranov group* of Γ is defined as,

$$\mathrm{Ts}(\Gamma) := \langle t_1, \dots, t_n : t_i^3 = 1, (t_i t_j^{-1})^2 = 1, \text{if } i \sim j, (t_i t_j)^2 = 1, \text{if } i \nsim j \rangle.$$

For (K_n, f), the last two relations can be written as $(t_i t_j^{f(\{i,j\})})^2 = 1$. One of the key features is that switching equivalent signings give isomorphic Tsaranov groups.

We can extend $\mathrm{Ts}(\Gamma)$ by an automorphism which inverts every generator:

$$\mathrm{Ts}^*(\Gamma) = \langle \mathrm{Ts}(\Gamma), t : t^2 = 1,\ tt_i t = t_i^{-1},\ i = 1, \dots, n \rangle.$$

With substitutions $x_0 = t,\ x_i = tu_i\ (i = 1, \dots, n)$,

$$\mathrm{Ts}^*(\Gamma) \cong \mathrm{Cox}(\overline{\Gamma + 0})/N \cong \mathrm{Cox}(\overline{\Gamma + 0}, +)$$

where N is the normal closure of

$$\{(x_0 x_i x_0 x_j)^2 : \{0, i, j\} \textit{ is a triangle in } \overline{\Gamma + 0}\},$$

which are just the cut relations for the triangles if we impose the positive signing, and where the + sign in the final term denotes a positive intersection matrix.

Two-graphs arising from Trees

Let T denote a tree which we assume has the fundamental signing, with its intersection matrix $2I - A(T)$ being the Gram matrix of a root basis $B = \{e_k\}$ of the root lattice $\mathbb{L}(T, -)$. Take a fixed vertex 0 as root. For any other vertex j, let $(0, j) = (j_1 = 0, j_2, \dots, j_s = j)$ be the unique path from 0 to j. Then $D = \{d_j\}$; $\quad d_j = \Sigma_{i=0}^{s} e_{j_i}$ is a new basis for $\mathbb{L}(T, -)$. It is possible to check that

$$(d_j, d_k) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } j = k \\ 1 & \text{if } (0, j) \subset (0, k) \textit{ or } (0, k) \subset (0, j) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus the Gram matrix of D has the form $2I + E(\Delta, +)$, where Δ is the graph on the same vertex set as T, in which $i \sim j$ if and only if $(0, i) \subset (0, j)$ or vice versa. The graph $\Gamma(T)$ is said to *arise from* the tree T if the graph is obtained from the complement of Δ by deleting the vertex 0 and all edges issuing from it.

In the tree T, we call j a *predecessor* of k, or k a *successor* of j, if $(0, j) \subset (0, k)$. If in addition, $j \sim k$ (in T), then k is an *immediate successor* of j.

4.3. Theorem. *Given a tree T with vertex 0, let $\Gamma(T)$ be defined as above. Then*

$$\mathrm{Ts}^*(\Gamma(T)) \cong \mathrm{Cox}(T).$$

Different choices of root vertex 0 yield switching-equivalent graphs.

To summarize: in [**123**] the Coxeter group of a signed graph was defined to be the quotient of the usual Coxeter graph by relations from the presentation of the Weyl group, and in this case it is isomorphic to the Weyl group. For each chordless cycle in the graph on vertices

$x_1, \ldots, x_n$ carrying an odd number of + signs there is such a relation of the form

$$(x_1 x_2 \ldots x_{n-1} x_n x_{n-1} \ldots, x_2)^2 = 1. \tag{1}$$

This relation is independent of the starting point or direction of the cycle. This paper also introduced the idea of *local switching* which correspond to natural operations on bases for a given root system, as well as "clusters" – partitions of signed graphs formed by repeated local switching. The paper investigated the case of a non-positive definite adjacency matrix, which corresponds to a root system in a real vector space with indefinite inner product. In the positive semidefinite case the authors used the theory of vanishing lattices from singularity theory to explain the positive semi-definite case where the Weyl group is a semi-direct product of the additive group of a lattice with a finite Weyl group.

In [**30**], Michael Barot and Robert Marsh discovered that the simply-laced (ADE) case of local switching corresponds to cluster mutation in the theory of *cluster algebras*. We refer to the papers of Fomin and Zelevinsky [**217**] for the definition and theory of these structures, but mention that a central theorem says that a mutation class of seeds is finite if and only if one of them has a graph which is a Coxeter-Dynkin diagram. This is surprising partly because cluster algebras are associated with directed graphs, whereas Coxeter-Dynkin diagrams are undirected. In order to make the correspondence work, it is necessary to symmetrise the digraphs. The Weyl group presentations in the ADE case are the same in [**123**] as in [**30**], however the work in [**30**] is more general in that they deal with the other Coxeter-Dynkin diagrams (of types BFG) as well, and that in [**123**] is more general in that they study the non-positive-definite case.

2. Local Switching of Multicoloured Graphs

In this section we begin a generalization of the notion of local switching from two-coloured to multicoloured graphs. It will transpire that there is a slightly generalized closed switching group and accompanying conserved parity, analogous to those identified in the final section of the previous chapter.

Assume that $m \geq 3$. Take as the basic object a complete graph with an ordering of the colours on each edge. This object is equivalent to an m-tuple of edge-coloured graphs, say $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_m$ such that for every edge e, all m colours appear once on e in $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_m$. We call this object, a *set of complete multicoloured graphs with a list of edge-colours*

on each edge, an *SML graph* Υ , which comprises an underlying graph Γ and an ordered tuple of colours on each edge.

There is a dual way to view this definition. Either (a) as a complete graph with an ordering of colours on each edge, or (b) as an m-tuple of edge-coloured complete graphs such that each colour occurs on a given edge in one of the graphs.

Perhaps category theory could provide a suitable terminology and techniques for its study, but we want to avoid being taken too far from the concepts of the two-coloured case, where the switching simply means colour transposition on an edge.

Take a standard reference SML graph with an ordered m-tuple $(c_1, \ldots, c_m)$ of colours on *every* edge. There is a map ϕ from Υ to signed complete graphs such that $\phi(\Upsilon)$ has sign + (respectively −) on e according to whether the list of colours on $e \in \Upsilon$ is an even (respectively odd) permutation of the starting colour configuration.

A switching $\sigma_{v,\pi}$ means apply permutation π to the list of colours on all edges containing vertex v.

Now,

$$\phi(\sigma_{v,\pi}(\Upsilon)) = \begin{cases} \phi(\Upsilon) & \text{if } \pi \text{ is an even switching of } \phi(\Upsilon) \text{ at } v, \\ \sigma_v(\phi(\Upsilon)) & \text{if } \pi \text{ is an odd switching of } \phi(\Upsilon) \text{ at } v, \\ & \text{where } \sigma_v \text{ is ordinary switching.} \end{cases}$$

Henceforth we write (Υ, ϕ) for an SML graph, complete with its parity signings. With the above assumption on the standard reference graph, for $m = 2$ colours ϕ would reduce to an isomorphism with: $(c_1, c_2) \to +$, and $(c_2, c_1) \to -$.

We can then generalize the $m = 2$ definitions to the case of $m \geq 3$:

- The *parity* (sign parity) of a signed cycle of multicoloured edges is the parity of the number of its edges which carry a *positive* sign (derived from an even permutation of the colours on that edge.)
- The *balance* of a signed cycle of multicoloured edges is the product of the signs of the colour permutations on its edges.

A signed cycle has two switching classes, as for the 2-coloured case. Both parity and balance are switching class invariants but are not independent graph invariances; they are essentially the same thing, for example, two signings of a connected graph are switching equivalent if and only if they have the same balance.

The multicoloured version of some basic facts of two-coloured graphs are true, as in the next two results:

4.4. LEMMA. *Two SML graphs based on a finite tree are switching equivalent.*

PROOF. Induct on the number of vertices. Consider an SML graph Υ based on a tree T with n vertices and where v is a leaf.

Let $T' = T\backslash\{v\}$, with Υ' the (restricted) SML graph based on T'. By induction, switch Υ' such that all edge permutations are the identity. The switchings involved will effect an induced switching about v, call it π, in the enlarged tree T. Now a switch by $\sigma_{v,\pi^{-1}}$ at v proves the proposition. □

We have stated the proof for finite trees, but because infinite trees have no leaves it would require some more formalism to prove the theorem still works.

4.5. PROPOSITION. *Two connected SML graphs are switching equivalent if and only if they have the same balance.*

PROOF. Consider first the spanning tree of an arbitrary SML graph. By Lemma 4.4 we can switch so as to effect the identity permutation on all its edges. Consider any other edge of the underlying graph and without loss of generality consider an even permutation of the colours on it. Even permutations lie in the derived subgroup of the permutation group of colours. So consider switchings about the two vertices v, w on the chosen edge. Take $g \in \sigma_{v,\pi_1}$ and $h \in \sigma_{w,\pi_2}$, where $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \mathrm{Sym}(c_1, \ldots, c_m)$, we can see that the commutator $g^{-1}h^{-1}gh$ lies in $\mathrm{Alt}(c_1, \ldots, c_m)$, and so a graph switching is a product of commutators. For the commutator is the identity on all edges except $\{v, w\}$. This is clear for edges containing neither v nor w. If $\{v, u\}$ is an edge then h acts trivially on colours of $\{v, u\}$ so the commutator acts as $g^{-1}g = 1$. Similarly for edges containing w.

Therefore SML graphs are switching equivalent if and only if the parities of the cycles are the same.

□

This proposition proves that balance is an invariant with respect to switching.

For each fixed number m of colours, there is an inverse system of switching groups on graphs with n vertices, which in the $n \to \omega$ limit gives a *profinite group*. This group is isomorphic as a topological group to a closed subgroup of a Cartesian product of symmetric groups of degree $m \geq 3$, in the topology defined by the imprimitive action for the cartesian product where each fibre comprises the colour set $(c_1, \ldots, c_m)$ of an edge. There is a parity equivalence between two m-coloured SML

graphs, if the ordered m tuple of colours of each edge of one graph is a parity-preserving permutation of those on the second graph. This parity is preserved by any switching $\sigma_{X,\pi} := \prod_{v \in X} \sigma_{v,\pi}$ which has an even parity, and the elements of the closed switching group are precisely the parity-preserving permutations fixing all the fibres on edges. This slight generalization of Theorem 3.7, embodied in Lemma 4.4 and the subsequent proposition, works because the cycle space is spanned by triangles.

What novel features arise in the local switching theory when we go from two to many colours?

First we mention that we loose the original geometric motivation, which arises from the fact that if the symmetric adjacency matrix of a signed graph E (with entries $0, \pm 1$) has least eigenvalue $-\alpha$, then $\alpha I + E$ defines a set of lines whose angles θ satisfy $cos(\theta) \in \{0, \frac{1}{\alpha}\}$. A signed complete graph defines a two-graph and a set of equiangular lines [**482**]. Seidel switching reverses the directions of the lines. But in the case of many colours, there is no clear geometric interpretation; if there are as many angles between the lines as there are colours, then what does multicoloured switching do?

What we gain however is a *duality* on SML graphs between graph number and edge colour, that is a duality between the ith graph having colour j on an edge and the jth graph having colour i on that edge. Here colour refers to either the colour on a fixed reference edge or a reference ordered tuple of colours. In the two-colour case this reduces to a *self-duality*. This fact provides us with m^2 matrices as a function of both colour and edge numbers. For the inner product matrix of a set of vectors v_i has $v_i \cdot v_i = 2$ along the diagonal and $v_i \cdot v_j \in \{\pm 1, 0\}$ $i \neq j$. If the matrix is positive definite then these vectors span a root lattice. Let $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and let v, w be vertices of a graph. Let M_{ij} be the matrix with v, w entry 0 if $v = w$ or if $v \not\sim w$, and if $v \sim w$ then an entry of 1 in the case of the ith colour on the list on $\{v, w\}$ $(i \leq j)$ and 0 otherwise. Each M_{ij} is then a symmetric 0–1 matrix such that

$$\sum_i M_{ij} = \sum_j M_{ij} = A,$$

where A is the adjacency matrix of the graph.

We leave for future work, the study of a object that is a dual to an SML graph. Define a *dual SML graph* DSML to be *a colour with a list of graphs forming an SML graph*, which we can symbolise as Υ^D.

Any symmetric is the inner product matrix of a set of vectors in some possibly indefinite (and degenerate) inner product space. But it may happen that linear combinations of these vectors are dense in some

subspace, so not a lattice. matrix with $0, \pm 1$ entries can be taken as the Gram matrix of a root basis giving rise to a lattice. More specifically, given an SML graph (Υ, ϕ), can we use it to define root lattices and Weyl, Coxeter and Tsaranov groups, and if so what do they look like?

In the two-colour case, the root lattice $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$ and Weyl group of $\mathbb{L}$ are local switching invariants, because switching (Γ, f) reflects the root bases of the lattice, thus $e_i \mapsto -e_i$. An SML graph (Υ, ϕ) may be considered as a *set of global* objects corresponding to a *local* set of lattice root bases - the same set of m lattices can give different (m-sets of) SML graphs.

But what would be the combinatorial origin of these?

The signed $(\pm)$ switching that we have derived from the parity of permutations of colours on the graph edges simulates two-colour switching, and allows us to retrieve properties of random graphs that are lost for graphs of three or more colours. In particular there is a link between cohomology and two-graphs which we now briefly recall, leaving the full details to references [**79**] [**206**, p.57].

Recall from Chapter 2, that the set of all graphs on a given vertex set forms a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-vector space, where the sum of two graphs is obtained by taking the symmetric difference of their edge sets. Switching a graph corresponds to adding to it a complete bipartite graph. So the switching classes are the cosets of the subspace V_0 of all complete bipartite graphs, including the null and complete graphs; alternatively V_0 is the set of all switching operations.

Let Γ be a graph giving rise to a two-graph $\mathcal{T}(\Gamma)$ with automorphism group G. Because any two such graphs lie in the same switching class, we can define a derivation function $d : G \to V_0 : g \mapsto (g\Gamma - \Gamma)$. There is an element of the *first cohomology group* of G on V_0, $\gamma \in H^1(G, V_0)$, called the *first invariant* of $\mathcal{T}(\Gamma)$ with the property that $\gamma = 0$ if and only if there is a graph $\Gamma' \in V_0 + \Gamma$ such that $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma')$. In other words, that there exist switching classes where the first cohomological invariant is non-zero, means that there are switching classes for which the group of automorphisms is strictly larger than the group of automorphisms of its graphs. The invariant that we derive from the LP_m parity of the SML graphs is isomorphic to this one for simple graphs. There is a double cover of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}(\Gamma))$ which is strongly split if and only if G preserves a graph in the same switching class as $\mathfrak{R}$. The 2-transitive automorphism group of the two-graph corresponding to the random graph cannot preserve any graph in the same switching class as $\mathfrak{R}$, so γ cannot be zero and the double cover is not strongly split. As point stabilizers in G are irreducible, the double cover of the two-graph of the random graph is not split.

David Harries and Hans Liebeck [**271**] define a permutation group G on a finite set X to be *always exposable* if whenever G stabilizes a switching class of graphs Γ on X, G fixes a graph in the switching class. In terms of Cameron's graph invariants [**79**], this is equivalent to saying that G is always exposable if the first invariant of G and every two-graph $\mathcal{T}(\Gamma)$ on operand X are zero. The problem they solved was which permutation representations of G are always exposable when G is dihedral, noting that Mallows and Sloane had already solved the cyclic group case in [**381**]. In [**356**], Hans's son Martin solved the problem for several other types of groups.

We shall revisit the combination of graphs, groups and lattices in a different context in Chapter 6, where we shall prove further results.

Open Question. Coloured Coxeter and Tsaranov Groups

In order to make contact with the theory expounded in [**123**] for two-colour graphs, elements of which were summarised in the first section of this chapter, and to fully develop multicoloured versions of the connections made through local switchings between lattices, Weyl groups and Lie algebras, we require multicoloured versions of Coxeter and Tsaranov groups, and one direction to pursue would be through presentations of multicoloured switching groups, which we outline in the two chapter appendices.

Recall that the *Coxeter group* $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$ of a simple (that is two-coloured) graph Γ is defined to have a generator s_v for each graph vertex v such that $s_v^2 = 1, (s_v s_w)^3 = 1$ if $v \sim w$, and $(s_v s_w)^2 = 1$ if $v \nsim w$ because all the relations have even length. The set of all products of even length in the generators forms a normal subgroup of index 2, called the *even part* of the Coxeter group, $\mathrm{Cox}^+(\Gamma)$. Analogously the *Tsaranov group*, $\mathrm{Ts}(X, \Omega)$ has a generator t_v for each vertex such that $t_v^3 = 1, (t_v t_w^{-1})^2 = 1$ if $v \sim w$, and $(t_v t_w)^2 = 1$ if $v \nsim w$. Switching a graph with respect to a vertex set corresponds to replacing Tsaranov's generators for vertices in this set with their inverses; so $\mathrm{Ts}(X, \Omega)$ is an invariant of the switching class, and so therefore, of the two-graph.

Find a generalization of the theory of this chapter, and in particular of multicoloured Coxeter and Tsaranov groups that reduces to these definitions in the two-coloured case. Could the derived coloured Coxeter and Tsaranov groups have the SML graphs as operands?

Some Results on Trees

A *tree* is a connected graph without cycles. There are maps from trees to two-graphs with a Tsaranov group $\mathrm{Ts}(X,\Omega)$ being represented by the two-graph [**95**]. A two-graph contains a graph Γ as an *induced subgraph* if Γ is a subgraph of some graph in the switching class of the two-graph. The Tsaranov group is the even subgroup of the Coxeter group of the tree and if (X,Ω) arises from a tree T by a certain map, then $\mathrm{Ts}(X,\Omega) \cong \mathrm{Cox}^+(T)$ [**123**], which is proved in [**484**] as follows.

4.6. THEOREM (Seidel and Tsaranov). *If (X,Ω) is a two-graph arising from a tree T, then* $\mathrm{Ts}(X,\Omega) \cong \mathrm{Cox}^+(T)$.

PROOF. Assume the Coxeter group $\mathrm{Cox}(T)$ is generated by involutions representing the vertices of the tree T.

We require the following construction [**95**]. Let $E(T)$ be the edge set of the connected tree T. The triples of edges of T are of two kinds: one edge is situated between the other two, or none is between the other two. If Ω is the set of triples of edges in T of the type none between the others, then consideration of the possibilities for quadruples of edges leads us to (X,Ω) being a two-graph.

We will use an equivalent way of phrasing this construction from $(n+1)$-vertex trees T to two-graphs (X,Ω) on n vertices, which has been given by Ivanov [**484**]. Let v be a terminal vertex of T. Define a graph Γ_v on the vertex set $V(T)\backslash\{v\}$, where two vertices x,y are adjacent if and only if neither one of the shortest paths, x,v and y,v in T contains the other. Distinct vertices $u,v \in T$ yield switching equivalent graphs $\Gamma_u = \Gamma_v$. This gives a two-graph (X,Ω) from the tree T.

Now, let $\mathrm{Ts}(\Gamma_v)$ be generated by order-3 elements x_w, indexed by $w \in V(\Gamma_v) = V(T)\backslash\{v\}$. Let $(v,s,t,\ldots,u,w)$ denote the shortest path connecting v and w. Associate with each vertex w the element $y_w := v \cdot v^{st\ldots uw} \in \mathrm{Cox}(T)$.

It can be shown that the following two maps ϕ,ϕ' are both epimorphisms

$$\phi : \mathrm{Ts}^*(\Gamma_v) \to \mathrm{Cox}(T) : x_w \mapsto y_w, \qquad x_0 \mapsto v$$

$$\phi' : \mathrm{Cox}(T) \to \mathrm{Ts}^*(\Gamma_v) : w \mapsto (x_0x_w)^{x_u^{-1}} = x_ux_0x_wx_u^{-1}, \qquad v \mapsto x_0$$

The composite map $\phi\circ\phi'$ acts on the generators of $\mathrm{Cox}(T)$ by

$$(\phi\circ\phi')(w) = \phi(\phi'(w)) = \phi(x_ux_0x_wx_u^{-1}) = y_uy_0y_wy_u^{-1}.$$

This term can be shown to equal w and so $\phi\circ\phi'$ is the identity, and both ϕ and ϕ' are isomorphisms. □

If T is a tree with edge set E and Ω is the set of 3-subsets of E not contained in paths in T, then (E,Ω) is a two-graph. There is a map [**96**] from trees to two-graphs characterising its image by excluded substructures. It was proved that a two-graph (E,Ω), arises from a tree by this construction if and only if it contains neither the pentagon nor the hexagon as induced substructures. Further if the two-graphs arising from trees T_1, T_2 are isomorphic then $T_1 \cong T_2$. With a rooted tree (T,r), there is a partial order on the vertices with r as the least element. The graph $\Gamma(T,r)$ of this partial order, with r deleted has two vertices, x, y nonadjacent if and only if the path from r to x contains y or vice versa. A graph Γ is isomorphic to $\Gamma(T,r)$ for some rooted tree if and only if Γ contains neither a path of length 3 nor 2 disjoint edges as induced subgraphs. Furthermore if $\Gamma(T_1,r_1)$ and $\Gamma(T_2,r_2)$ are isomorphic graphs then (T_1,r_1) and (T_2,r_2) are isomorphic rooted trees. Also under this map a graph $\Gamma \cong \Gamma(T,r)$ is associated to some rooted tree (T,r) if and only if Γ is *N-free* (where an N is a path of length 3) and contains no two disjoint edges if and only if Γ_x is *N-free*, where Γ_x is the graph in its switching class for which x is isolated, for some or all $x \in X$ [**96**].

Let Γ_x, $x \in X$ be the unique graph in the switching class for which x is an isolated vertex. A pentagon can be switched into a path of length 3 and an isolated vertex. The following are equivalent:

(i) Γ_x is N-free for some $x \in X$;

(ii) Γ_x is N-free for all $x \in X$;

(iii) The two-graph (X,Ω) is pentagon-free.

The amalgamation property can be restored to the class of pentagon-free two-graphs by adding a quaternary relation.

By a second construction [**95**], a two-graph arises from a tree if and only if the two-graph does not contain the pentagon as an induced substructure. Here, only isomorphic coloured reduced trees yield isomorphic two-graphs. There are also formulae [**96**] for the number of labeled two-graphs obtained by the above constructions.

Open Questions.

1. Can we generalize the two-colour results of Cameron [**95**] [**96**] perhaps using a multicoloured parity, for example P_m-equivalence of Chapter 2 or the P_m of Chapter 3 or some other version, and find maps from trees with multicoloured edges to $\mathrm{Ts}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$? Is there a condition, perhaps related to monochromatic N-freeness Chapter 11), under which the coloured graphs are associated to rooted trees?

2. Homomorphisms between edge-coloured graphs and Coxeter groups arise naturally and have been studied before, for example in [**11**],

and can also lead to a fruitful avenue for research. For two edge-coloured graphs $\Gamma_1 = (V_1, E_1), \Gamma_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ with no multiple edges or loops, there is a *homomorphism* $\phi : V_1 \mapsto V_2$ if for every pair of adjacent vertices $u, v \in \Gamma_1$, $\phi(u)$ and $\phi(v)$ are adjacent in Γ_2 and the colour of edge $\phi(u)\phi(v)$ is the same as that of the edge uv.

Form an edge-coloured graph $\gamma(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$ from the presentation of $\mathrm{Ts}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$ taking the generators a_{ij}^k as vertices and joining a_{ij}^k and a_{ij}^l whenever $(a_{ij}^k a_{ij}^l)^2 = 1$. The index two subgroup $\mathrm{Ts}^0(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$ consists of products of an even number of generators of the form $\{\gamma_{kl} = a_{ij}^k a_{ij}^l\}$ and relations $a_{ij}^3 = 1$. The γ_{kl} represent directed edges in $\gamma(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$. The cubed relations correspond to directed triangles and relations of the form $\gamma_{kl}\gamma_{lm}\ldots\gamma_{qk}$ to directed circuits. A free product of Tsaranov groups leads to a disjoint union of graphs. Can this formalism be developed?

3. Appendix 1: A First Presentation of $S_{m,n}$

A *Coxeter group* has generators $s_1, \ldots, s_k$ and relations $s_i^2 = 1$ and $(s_i s_j)^{m_{ij}} = 1$, where $m_{ij} = \{2, 3, \ldots, \infty\}$. The finite Coxeter groups are the finite real reflection groups [**298**].

The Coxeter group $\mathrm{Cox}(\Gamma)$ may be defined on a graph Γ and is generated by vertices $s_i \in \Gamma$ $(i \in I)$, such that

$s_i^2 = 1$	$\forall\, s_i \in \Gamma$;
$(s_i s_j)^2 = 1 \Leftrightarrow s_i s_j = s_j s_i$	if s_i, s_j are disjoint;
$(s_i s_j)^3 = 1 \Leftrightarrow s_i s_j s_i = s_j s_i s_j$	if s_i, s_j are joined by a single edge;
$(s_i s_j)^{m_{ij}} = 1$	where an edge is labelled m_{ij} or there are $m_{ij} - 2$ parallel edges.

For example, $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ is a Coxeter group represented by the following diagram:



which has $n - 1$ nodes indexed by $(i \in I)$, and where $s_i \mapsto (i, i+1)$.

In this chapter we derive two presentations of the switching groups $S_{m,n}$ for graphs on n vertices and m colours, the second of which leads us to define and study a type of generalized Coxeter group, with the following as basic motivation.

Any group is isomorphic to a quotient of a free group. If the map $\phi : F \to G$ is a homomorphism from an n-generator free group F onto an n-generator group G, then G is presented by the generators of $\ker(\phi)$ as normal subgroup of F and the relations $\ker(\phi)$. To show that there is a homomorphism from a group $G = \langle g_1, \ldots, g_n | r_1, \ldots r_k \rangle$ to a group H, we need to find $h_1, \ldots, h_n \in H$ such that $r_i(h_1, \ldots, h_n) = 1$ in H.

Then $g_i \mapsto h_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$ extends to a unique homomorphism $G \to H$. The following theorem is instructive,

4.7. THEOREM (Dyck's theorem). *Let $\phi : F \to G$ and $\phi' : F \to H$ denote homomorphisms from the free group onto groups G and H with* $\ker(\phi) \leq \ker(\phi')$. *Then there is a homomorphism $\phi'' : G \to H$ such that* $\ker(\phi'') = \ker(\phi')/\ker(\phi)$.

The first presentation of $S_{m,n}$ is given in terms of switchings. To build an intuition for what the relations satisfied look like for a general m and n, we work out the simplest $m = 3 = n$ and $m = 3, n = 4$ cases using GAP 4 to verify our results.

As we saw in a previous chapter, the group $S_{3,3}$ is 4-generated by $\sigma_{i,j,1}$, $\sigma_{j,k,1}$, $\sigma_{i,j,2}$, $\sigma_{j,k,2}$. It has four types of relations:

(i) those corresponding to the generators being involutions, for example $\sigma_{i,j,1}^2 = 1$,

(ii) Klein 4-group 'row' relations of the form $\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{i,j,2}\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{i,j,2} = 1$,

(iii) Sym(3)-group 'column' relations of the form $\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{j,k,1}\sigma_{i,j,1} = \sigma_{j,k,1}\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{j,k,1}$,

(iv) two extra 'diagonal' relations required to get a finite group from our starting infinite free group, $(\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{j,k,2})^2 = (\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{j,k,1}\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{i,j,2})^2$, and $(\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{j,k,2})^2 = (\sigma_{j,k,1}\sigma_{i,j,2}\sigma_{j,k,2}\sigma_{i,j,2})^2$. The origin of these relations can be demystified by noticing that $(\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{j,k,2})^2$ is a 3-cycle (ijk) on edge $\{1, 2\}$ and the identity elsewhere, and that $(\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{j,k,1}\sigma_{i,j,1}\sigma_{i,j,2})^2 = (\sigma_{i,k,1}\sigma_{i,j,2})^2$ is the same. Similarly for the second relation.

Then starting with a free group on these four generators, we can factor out the relations to get a finitely presented group of the same order as $S_{3,3}$, namely 108, as follows:

With `f.1, f.2, f.3, f.4` replacing $\sigma_{i,j,1}, \sigma_{j,k,1}, \sigma_{i,j,2}, \sigma_{j,k,2}$ respectively this translates to GAP 4 commands as follows:

```
gap> f := FreeGroup("R1", "R2", "R3", "R4");;
gap> g := f / [ f.1*f.1, f.2*f.2, f.3*f.3, f.4*f.4,
f.1*f.2*f.1*f.2*f.1*f.2, f.1*f.3*f.1*f.3,
f.3*f.4*f.3*f.4*f.3*f.4, f.2*f.4*f.2*f.4,
f.1*f.4*f.1*f.4*f.3*f.1*f.2*f.1*f.3*f.1*f.2*f.1,
f.1*f.4*f.1*f.4*f.3*f.4*f.3*f.2*f.3*f.4*f.3*f.2 ];
gap> Size(f); infinity
gap> Size(g); 108
```

That the relations in (iv) above are satisfied in $S_{3,3}$ is easily checked in GAP 4 through

```
gap> R1*R4*R1*R4=R1*R2*R1*R3*R1*R2*R1*R3; true
gap> R1*R4*R1*R4=R2*R3*R4*R3*R2*R3*R4*R3; true
```

We need to uncover the structure of the group `g`.

That `g` obeys the same relations as the group `G` from §7 of Chapter 2 means that by Dyck's theorem there is a homomorphism from one to the other. Then given that the two groups are of the same order, this is actually an isomorphism. So $\mathtt{g} \cong S_{3,3}$.

The next case to consider is that of 4 vertices and 3 edge-colours. The non-trivial switchings of colours c, d, e about vertices $1, 2$ or 3 are given by

$\sigma_{c,d,1}$ (`f.1`) $\quad$ $\sigma_{c,d,2}$ (`f.3`) $\quad$ $\sigma_{c,d,3}$ (`f.5`)

$\sigma_{d,e,1}$ (`f.2`) $\quad$ $\sigma_{d,e,2}$ (`f.4`) $\quad$ $\sigma_{d,e,3}$ (`f.6`)

FIGURE 2. Generators of $S_{3,4}$

Here $\sigma_{c,d,1}$ means a switch of colours c and d whenever they occur on an edge about vertex 1. With `f.1, ..., f.6` replacing $\sigma_{c,d,1}, \ldots, \sigma_{d,e,3}$, this translates to GAP 4 commands that are similar to those above for $S_{3,3}$ and lead to:

```
gap> Size(g1); 5832
```

This order of `g1` is the same as that of the group $S_{3,4}$. It can be checked using GAP 4 that the generators of `g1` satisfy the same relations as those of $S_{3,4}$, so there is a homomorphism from `g1` to $S_{3,4}$. Therefore the groups are isomorphic. The 3 column relations and 6 row relations are followed by 12 'diagonal' relations which are motivated for example by the following diagram:

This gives $(\sigma_{c,d,1}\sigma_{d,e,2})^2 = (\sigma_{c,e,1}\sigma_{c,d,2})^2$ which becomes $(\mathtt{f.1*f.4})^2 = (\mathtt{f.1*f.2*f.1*f.3})^2$.

Other examples of composite relations are:
$\sigma_{c,e,1} = \mathtt{f.1*f.2*f.1}$, $\sigma_{c,e,2} = \mathtt{f.3*f.4*f.3}$, $\sigma_{c,e,3} = \mathtt{f.5*f.6*f.5}$, $\sigma_{c,d,4} = \mathtt{f.1*f.3*f.5}$, $\sigma_{d,e,4} = \mathtt{f.2*f.4*f.6}$.

The two cases above having been identified, we use the Reidemeister-Schreier algorithm to give us a presentation of $S_{m,n}$ as follows. From the proof of Theorem 2.19 there is a homomorphism $S_{m,n} \to C_2^{n-1}$, the kernel of which is a group in which we identify a (right) Schreier transversal with the Schreier property. The Schreier transversal has



FIGURE 3. Motivating the diagonal relations of $S_{m,n}$

$|S_{m,n}/S_{m,n-1}| = n-1$ elements in it, which we can take to be $\sigma_{c,d,i}$ for $(1 \le i \le n-1)$.

Using the Reidemeister-Schreier algorithm, we can find a presentation for this subgroup via coset representatives of it in $S_{m,n}$. This is laid out in the table below.

	$\sigma_{c,d,j}$ $(1 \le j \le n)$ $(i \ne j)$	$\sigma_{d,c',j}\sigma_{c,d,i}\sigma_{d,c',j}$ $(1 < j \le n)$ $(\forall c \ne d \ne c')$	$\sigma_{c',d',i}\sigma_{c,d,i}$ $(1 \le i \le n)$ $(\{c,d\} \ne \{c',d'\})$
$\sigma_{c,d,i}$	$\sigma_{c,d,i} \cdot \sigma_{c,d,j}$ $\cdot(\sigma_{c,d,i}\sigma_{c,d,j})$	$\sigma_{c,d,i} \cdot (\sigma_{d,c',j}\sigma_{c,d,i}.\sigma_{d,c',j})$ $\cdot(\sigma_{c,d,j}\sigma_{c,c',i})^2$	$\sigma_{c,d,i} \cdot (\sigma_{c',d',i} \cdot \sigma_{c,d,i})$ $\cdot(\sigma_{c',d',i}\sigma_{c,d,i}\sigma_{c',d',i})$

Finally we arrive at:

$S_{m,n} = \langle \sigma_{c,d,i}, 1 \le i \le n, 1 \le c < d \le m, \mid \sigma_{c,d,i}^2 = 1, \forall c,d,i,$
$(\sigma_{c,d,i}\sigma_{c,d,j})^2 = 1, \forall c,d,(i \ne j),\ (\sigma_{c,d,i}\sigma_{c',d',i})^3 = 1, \forall i\ \forall \{c,d\} \ne \{c',d'\},$
$(\sigma_{c,d,i}\sigma_{d,c',j})^2 = (\sigma_{c,c',i}\sigma_{c,d,j})^2\ (= (\sigma_{c,d,i}\sigma_{d,c',j}\sigma_{c,d,i}\sigma_{c,d,j})^2),\ (\forall c \ne d \ne c')$
$(\forall i < j)\rangle$.

The *m-strand braid group* is defined by $B_m := \langle b_1, \ldots, b_{m-1} \mid b_i b_{i+1} b_i = b_{i+1} b_i b_{i+1},\ i = 1,2,\ldots,m-2,\ b_i b_j = b_j b_i,\ |i-j| \ge 2\rangle$. The braid group has the symmetric group as a quotient. There is a homomorphism from the direct product of two braid groups into $S_{3,3}$ via symmetric groups. To see this write the generators and relations of the 3-braid

group suggestively as $B_3 \times B_3 = \langle b_1^{(1)}, b_2^{(1)} \rangle \times \langle b_1^{(2)}, b_2^{(2)} \rangle = \langle a, b \rangle \times \langle c, d \rangle$

$$a\ (b_1^{(1)}) \qquad c\ (b_1^{(2)})$$

$$b\ (b_2^{(1)}) \qquad d\ (b_2^{(2)})$$

satisfying $aba = bab, cdc = dcd, ac = ca, bd = db, ad = da, bc = cb$ and that of the switching group as $S_{3,3} =$

$$A\ (\sigma_{i,j,1}) \qquad C\ (\sigma_{i,j,2})$$

$$B\ (\sigma_{j,k,1}) \qquad D\ (\sigma_{j,k,2})$$

satisfying $A^2 = 1,\ B^2 = 1,\ C^2 = 1,\ D^2 = 1,\ ABA = BAB, CDC = DCD, AC = CA, BD = DB, (ABAC)^2 = (AD)^2, (BCDC)^2 = (AD)^2$.

To show that there is a homomorphism from $B_3 \times B_3 \to S_{3,3}$ we need to verify that the $S_{3,3}$ relations imply the $B_3 \times B_3$ relations. This is readily confirmed using GAP 4.

Consider the transformations: $a \to ADA,\ d \to DAD,\ b \to BCB,$ $c \to CBC$. Using GAP 4 we can verify that ADA, DAD, BCB, CBC generate a group of order 36 using the defining relations of $S_{3,3}$ we gave in Chapter 2 above. In the GAP 4 code that follows we denote by `Q1` the homomorphic image of the mapping $B_3 \times B_3 \to S_{3,3}$, and we have to show that `Q1` = Sym(3) × Sym(3).

```
    gap> S := SymmetricGroup(27);
    gap> P1 := (1,7)(2,4)(3,8)(5,6)(9,18)(10,25)(11,20)
(12,22)(13,24)(16,19)(17,26)(21,27);
gap> P2 := (1,14)(2,20)(3,23)(4,18)(5,26)(6,27)(9,11)
(10,15)(12,13)(16,24)(17,21)(19,22);
gap> P3 := (1,6)(2,8)(3,4)(5,7)(9,27)(10,19)(11,17)
(12,22)(14,23)(16,25)(18,21)(20,26);
gap> P4 := (1,13)(2,24)(3,17)(4,19)(5,26)(7,25)(9,15)
(10,11)(12,14)(16,20)(18,22)(21,23);
gap> G := Subgroup(S,[P1,P2,P3,P4]);
gap> gen1 := P1*P4*P1; (1,10)(2,16)(4,13)(6,17)(7,24)
(8,26)(9,12)(11,19)(14,22)(15,18)(20,25)(23,27)
gap> gen2 := P4*P1*P4; (1,2)(3,5)(4,20)(6,26)(7,11)(8,17)
(10,16)(13,25)(14,18)(15,22)(19,24)(23,27)
gap> gen3 := P2*P3*P2; (1,3)(2,5)(4,17)(6,11)(7,26)(8,20)
(9,21)(13,19)(14,27)(15,22)(18,23)(24,25)
gap> gen4 := P3*P2*P3; (1,9)(3,21)(4,14)(6,23)(7,20)
```

```
(8,26)(10,12)(11,18)(13,22)(15,19)(17,27)(24,25)
gap> Q1 := Subgroup(S,[gen1, gen2, gen3, gen4]);
gap> Size(Q1); 36
gap> IsSubgroup(G,Q1); true
gap> IsNormal(G,Q1); false
```

So certainly `Q1` has the correct order, and it remains to check that it has the required structure. We can do that in GAP 4 through commands such as

```
gap> gen1*gen3*gen1=gen3*gen1*gen3; true
gap> gen1*gen2=gen2*gen1; true
```

The homomorphism $B_3 \times B_3 \to S_{3,3}$ is not a surjection. Rather we have that $B_3 \times B_3 \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}(3) \times \mathrm{Sym}(3) \hookrightarrow S_{3,3}$. This says that in a sense a 3-switching is the commuting pair of two 3-braidings acting independently on two different triples of strings, modulo a 3-cycle. To see that this generalizes to $m, n > 3$ consider the following graph



This represents the product of $n-1$ copies of $\mathrm{Alt}(m)$, one on each edge. Switchings at the end vertices generate C_2^{n-1}. One switching at the apex vertex acts on each of a direct product of alternating groups. So there is an embedding of the direct product $\mathrm{Dr}_{1\le i\le n-1}\,\mathrm{Sym}(m)^i$ of groups into $S_{m,n}$.

That switching and hyperoctahedral groups have the same direct factors, but complementary normal subgroups and that switching and braid groups are homomorphically related, suggests the possible existence of representations for the switching groups related to those of type A or B Hecke algebras; see Chapter 11.

4. Appendix 2: A Second Presentation of $S_{m,n}$

A second type of $S_{m,n}$ presentation is given in terms of involutions about vertices and 3-cycles about edges, and can be recovered by inspection of the form of the switching groups. For example $S_{3,3} \cong (\mathrm{Alt}(3))^3 \rtimes (C_2)^2$ consists of 3 generators a_1, a_2, a_3 that are intended to represent three 3-cycles and two involutions b_1 and b_2 whose actions

are shown by the following picture



The presentation is given by

$S_{3,3} = \langle a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2 \mid a_i^3 = 1,\ [a_i, a_j] = 1,\ b_i^2 = 1,\ [b_i, b_j] = 1,$ $b_1^{-1}a_1b_1 = a_1,\ b_1^{-1}a_2b_1 = a_2^{-1},\ b_1^{-1}a_3b_1 = a_3^{-1},\ b_2^{-1}a_1b_2 = a_1^{-1},\ b_2^{-1}a_2b_2$ $= a_2,\ b_2^{-1}a_3b_2 = a_3^{-1}\rangle$. It is easily verified that this gives $S_{3,3}$ by

```
gap> f := FreeGroup("R1", "R2", "R3", "R4", "R5");;
gap> g := f / [ f.1*f.1*f.1, f.2*f.2*f.2, f.3*f.3*f.3,
f.4*f.4, f.5*f.5, f.1*f.2*f.1*f.2,
f.1*f.3*f.1*f.3, f.2*f.3*f.2*f.3, f.4*f.5*f.4*f.5,
f.4*f.1*f.4*f.1^-1, f.4*f.2*f.4*f.2^-1, f.4*f.3*f.4*f.3^-1,
f.5*f.1*f.5*f.1, f.5*f.2*f.5*f.2, f.5*f.3*f.5*f.3 ];
gap> Size(g); 108
```

We can use GAP 4 to show that this $S_{3,3}$ presentation is isomorphic to the one in the previous section.

This presentation generalizes to $n > 3$. First for convenience we change notation, for example letting a_1 above become a_{23}, etc.

Extrapolating from 3 to a finite number n of vertices, we can give generators for $S_{3,n}$ as $b_1, \ldots, b_{n-1}, a_{ij}, 1 \le i < j \le n$, where the b_i are transpositions of 2 colours on edges i, j for all $j \ne i$ and the a_{ij} are 3-cycles on colours on edge $\{i, j\}$. The relations are:

$a_{ij}^3 = 1, \quad [a_{ij}, a_{kl}] = 1\ (i, j \ne k, l), \quad b_i^2 = 1, \quad [b_i, b_j] = 1\ (i \ne j),$

$$b_i^{-1}a_{jk}b_i = \begin{cases} a_{jk}^{-1} & \text{if } j = i \text{ or } k = i \\ a_{jk} & \text{if } i \notin \{j, k\}. \end{cases}$$

Certainly $S_{3,n}$ satisfies this presentation. But we must show that this gives a defining set of relations for $S_{3,n}$. If G is a group defined by this presentation then $|G| \le |S_{3,n}|$ and $G \twoheadrightarrow S_{3,n}$. Therefore we have equality and a verification that this is a presentation for $S_{3,n}$.

We can extrapolating further from $m = 3$ to any finite number m of colours, and use the presentation

$$\mathrm{Alt}(m) = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_{m-2} | a_k^3 = 1,\ (a_k a_l)^2 = 1\ (k \ne l)\rangle.$$

This gives the generators for $S_{m,n}$ as: b_i where b_i is a 2-cycle $(m-1, m)$ on colours on all edges $\{i, j\}$ for all $1 \le i < j \le n$, and a_{ij}^k for $1 \le k \le m-2$ which are 3-cycles $(k, m-1, m)$ of colours on all edges $\{i, j\}$.

Then $(a_{ij}^k a_{ij}^l)^2 = ((k, m-1, m)(l, m-1, m))^2 = ((k\ m)(l\ m-1))^2 = 1$. The relations are:

$(a_{ij}^k)^3 = 1$, $(a_{ij}^k\ a_{ij}^l)^2 = 1$ $(l \neq k)$, $[a_{ij}^k,\ a_{i'j'}^l] = 1$ (if $\{i', j'\} \neq \{i, j\}$), $b_i^2 = 1$, $[b_i, b_{i'}] = 1$ (if $i \neq i'$),

$$b_h^{-1} a_{ij}^k b_h = \begin{cases} (a_{ij}^k)^{-1} & \text{if } h = i \text{ or } h = j \\ a_{ij}^k & \text{if } h \notin \{i, j\}. \end{cases}$$

Each edge $\{i, j\}$ represents one alternating group in the direct product expansion of $S_{m,n}$. To prove that this presentation defines precisely $S_{m,n}$, first recall the presentation

$\mathrm{Sym}(m) = \langle a_{ij}^1, \ldots, a_{ij}^{m-2},\ b_i : (a_{ij}^k)^3 = 1 = (a_{ij}^k a_{ij}^l)^2\ (i \neq j),$
$b_i^2 = 1,\ b_i a_{ij}^k b_i = (a_{ij}^k)^{-1} \rangle$ for fixed i, j and for all k.

Making the substitutions $a_{ij}^k \mapsto (k\ m-1\ m)$, $b_i \mapsto (m-1\ m)$ we see that the a_{ij}^k generate $\mathrm{Alt}(m)$. Then proceeding as for $S_{3,n}$ proves the presentation.

CHAPTER 5

Some Ring Theory around Random Graphs

What is now proved was once only imagined

William Blake, *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell, (1793)*

This chapter takes as its starting point the work of Cameron on the algebra of $\mathbb{Q}$-valued functions on n-subsets of an infinite set Ω, as outlined in Appendix 11. The algebra carries information on group actions on finite subsets of Ω. We will uncover further results on the structure of this algebra in specific cases.

1. Polynomial Algebras for Random Graphs

In this first section we build on the application of this theory of permutation group algebras to the case of multicoloured random graphs [**101**] [**105**].

Let $\mathfrak{R}_{m,n} \in \mathcal{G}_{m,n}$ denote the countable m-coloured random graph, with n vertices and m colours in the set of all such simple graphs. Fix m and let $\mathcal{G}$ be the class of all finite m-coloured graphs, V_n the vector space of functions from the isomorphism types of n-element structures in $\mathcal{G}$ to $\mathbb{Q}$, and $\mathcal{A} := \oplus_{n\geq 0} V_n$, the *age* of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,n}$ being the class of all finite structures embeddable in $\mathfrak{R}_{m,n}$ as induced substructures. We will determine the structure of $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{Aut(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})}$, working with a countably infinite set, $|n| = \aleph_0$.

Consider the following two conditions:

(C1) If a structure S is partitioned into disjoint induced substructures $S_1, S_2, \ldots$ then $S_1 \circ S_2 \circ \ldots \leq S$. (Here $\circ$ is a binary, commutative and associative law of composition, such that if X and Y are finite subgraphs, $X \circ Y$ is a subgraph with $|X| + |Y|$ vertices. The composition referred to here is that of structures that are not themselves compositions. Also the partial order $\leq$ indicates "involvement" on the class of n-element structures for each n).

(C2) Any structure has a unique representation as a composition of connected structures. We assume $\mathcal{G}$ to be a class of finite relational subgraphs closed under isomorphism and taking induced subgraphs.

If an age $\mathcal{A}$ has an isomorphism-closed subclass of "connected" structures, a "composition", and a partial order on n-element structures in the form of "involvement" such that (C1) and (C2) hold, then the algebra of $\mathcal{A}$ is freely generated by the characteristic functions of "connected" structures. The words in quotes do not have their usual meaning here.

If we take the age consisting of all finite graphs, let "connected" have its usual meaning, "involvement" be spanning subgraph, and "composition" be disjoint union, then (C1) and (C2) hold.

More concretely our generalization is to take finite 3-coloured complete graphs, where:

A is a "subgraph" of B if by changing some of the $\mathfrak{b}$ or $\mathfrak{r}$-adjacencies of B to $\mathfrak{g}$, that is 'throwing away' some $\mathfrak{b}$ or $\mathfrak{r}$ adjacencies, we get A; "connected" means $\mathfrak{rb}$-connected, that is any two vertices are joined by a path using only red and blue adjacencies, taking the green colour $\mathfrak{g}$ to represent a non-adjacency; "involvement" meaning changing some green edges to red or blue; "composition" meaning a disjoint union of finite $\mathfrak{rbg}$-subgraphs, with only $\mathfrak{g}$ edges between the parts. If we adopt these meanings then again conditions (C1) and (C2) hold.

We proceed as in [**101**, Theorem 2.1].

5.1. Theorem. *Assuming (C1) and (C2), $\mathcal{A}$ is a polynomial algebra generated by the characteristic functions of the connected structures.*

Proof. Let $S = \bigsqcup S_i$, where $|S| = n$ the S_i are connected structures and the union is disjoint. Let V_n and $\mathcal{A} := \oplus_{n\geq 0} V_n$, be as defined above. By definition the characteristic functions χ_S for $|S| = n$ form a basis for the vector space V_n. There is a bijection between χ_S and the monomials $\phi_S = \chi_{S_1}\chi_{S_2}\ldots$ of total weight n, where the S_i are connected and $S_1 \circ S_2 \circ \ldots = S$. The matrix expressing ϕ_S in terms of the basis vectors $\chi_{S'}$, has non-zero coefficient for χ_S in the row corresponding to ϕ_S. If $\chi_{S'}$ also has non-zero coefficients then S' has a partition into induced subgraphs isomorphic to the S_i. Thus $S = \bigsqcup S_i \leq S'$. The matrix corresponding to this is upper triangular where the ordering extends the partial ordering of involvement, with non-zero diagonal; so it is invertible. So the monomials of weight n themselves form a basis for V_n. □

To clarify the origin of the form of the matrix note that there is a partial order inherent in the choice of green edge regarded as a non-adjacency:

followed by either a red edge or a blue edge



That we can extend this partial order on n-element structures to a total order implies upper triangular transition matrices between bases, where the partial order on the coloured edges is induced onto the χs.

The theorem clearly holds for graphs on any fixed number m of colours.

5.2. Corollary. *For $H = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$, $\mathcal{A}^H$ is a polynomial algebra, and therefore an integral domain.*

Proof. With the identifications as above, applying the theorem gives that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})}$ is a polynomial algebra, whose generators correspond to the finite connected graphs. □

5.3. Corollary. *For $H = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, $4 \leq m \leq \aleph_0$, $\mathcal{A}^H$ is a polynomial algebra.*

Proof. The same method as above works for m colours if we take connected to mean connected in the first $m-1$ colours and take the final colour m to represent non-adjacency. □

Because $S_{m,\omega}$ is highly transitive for $m \geq 3$, $\mathcal{A}^{S_{m,\omega}}$ is a polynomial ring in one variable. Another way to see this is as a corollary of the theorem.

5.4. Corollary. *For $H = S_{m,\omega}, D_{m,\omega}$ or $B_{m,\omega}$, $4 \leq m \leq \aleph_0$, $\mathcal{A}^H$ is an integral domain.*

Proof. This is clear since $G_1 \leq G_2$ implies that $\mathcal{A}^{G_2} \leq \mathcal{A}^{G_1}$ and a subring of an integral domain is an integral domain. Finally of course a polynomial ring is an integral domain. □

Here $D_{m,\omega}$ is understood to mean take any subgroup $H \leq \mathrm{Sym}(m)$ and take all permutations of the vertices which induce a permutation from H on the colours, whilst for $S_{m,\omega}$ we take any partition of the set of colours and allow switching of colours between the parts.

If $\mathcal{A}^G$ is an integral domain, we say that G is *entire*.

Among the m distinct colours of the m-coloured random graph, $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ ($m \geq 2$), choose one distinguished "transparent" colour c_0. Taking connectedness to mean connected in the other $m-1$ colours yields, as we have seen, a polynomial algebra, the stabilized colour being the "non-adjacency" colour. As the action on the colour set $\mathcal{C}_m$ is transitive, $\mathrm{Sym}(m-1)$ stabilizes c_0 and permutes the other colours forming a single conjugacy class of subgroups of $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$. This translates into the

fact that $\mathrm{Sym}(m-1)$ acts on the polynomial algebra so as to permute the polynomial generators, the monomials ϕ_S. (The universality of the graph $\mathfrak{R}_{\omega,\omega}$ gives rise to a universal polynomial ring associated to it). So there is an invariant subalgebra generated by symmetric polynomials, but is it a polynomial algebra?

Furthermore consider the graph $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ on m colours $c_0, \ldots, c_{m-1}$ with c_0 transparent and $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$. Then $H \leq \mathrm{Sym}(m-1)$ leads to $D^H_{m,\omega}$ the group of all permutations of vertices which fix c_0 and induce an element of H on the remaining colours. This gives rise to the *Galois Correspondence*

$$H \leq \mathrm{Sym}(m-1) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{A}^{D^H_{m,\omega}}.$$

For all subgroups of $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ of degree m the algebra is an integral domain because in this case the automorphism groups are reducts. The correspondence arises because the larger the group the smaller the algebra. If $H = 1$ then $G = D^{\{1\}}_{m,\omega} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{A}^G$ where $\mathcal{A}^G$ is a polynomial ring generated by connected graphs. If $H = \mathrm{Sym}(m-1)$ then $\mathcal{A}^{D^H_{m,\omega}}$ is a polynomial ring if $m = 3$ but we conjecture that it is not if $m > 3$.

Open Question Is it true that $\mathcal{A}^{D^H_{m,\omega}}$ is a polynomial ring $\Leftrightarrow H$ is a Young subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(m-1)$ corresponding to a partition with parts of size 1 except at most one of size 2.

This would be false without the condition on the partitions, for $\mathrm{Sym}(m-1)$ itself is a Young subgroup. Further, even a partition of four colours into two pairs, say $\{c_1, c_2\}$ $\{c_3, c_4\}$ would allow a regular orbit under the Klein 4-group, giving the orbit



where the transparent edge is c_0. However the action of the group C_2 is always regular, so the open question is probably true as formulated.

More generally we could ask why do we get a polynomial ring if the orbit is *regular*? If G is a finite group acting on $\mathbb{C}[X]$, where X is any set of indeterminates, and there is a G-orbit Y such that $G \neq \mathrm{Sym}(Y)$ then is $\mathbb{C}[X]^G$ a polynomial ring?

We can get a stronger result as follows. Imagine $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ to act on the ordered partition $S = (S_1, \ldots, S_j)$ a natural way, that is as $S^g = (S_1^g, \ldots, S_j^g)$. Then the stabilizer of an element of the partition contains a *Young subgroup* of $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ which is isomorphic to $G := \mathrm{Sym}(n_1) \times \mathrm{Sym}(n_2) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{Sym}(n_j)$, where $|S_i| = n_i$ and $n = n_1 + \ldots + n_j$, $n_1 \geq \ldots \geq n_j > 0$ is a partition of n. Now it is known that if G is a Young subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ acting on a polynomial ring in n variables, then the ring of invariants of G is a polynomial ring in the elementary symmetric functions of degree $1, \ldots, n$. So here, $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{Sym}(n_1)} \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{Sym}(n_j)}$ is isomorphic to a ring of invariants on n_i homogeneous generators of degrees $1, \ldots, n_i$ which is a tensor product of invariants of the n_i orbits, for $1 \leq i \leq j$ [**90**, p. 79].

From the character theory of the symmetric group [**370**], if a partition $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots)$ determines a monomial $x^\pi = x^{\pi_1} x^{\pi_2} \ldots$, then the *monomial symmetric function* m_π is the sum of all distinct monomials obtainable from x^π by permutations of the $x's$, for example, $m_{(21)} = \sum x_i^2 x_j$ summed over all pairs (ij) such that $i \neq j$. When $\pi = (1^r)$, m_π is the rth *elementary symmetric function*

$$e_r = m_{(1^r)} = \sum_{i_1 < \ldots < i_r} x_{i_1} \ldots x_{i_r}$$

with $e_0 = 1$. The equations $e_{\pi'} = m_\pi + \sum_{\mu < \pi} a_{\pi\mu} m_\mu$ with nonnegative integer coefficients $a_{\pi\mu}$ are of triangular form so can be solved for m_π in terms of the e_μ. Now the χ and ϕ functions in Theorem 5.1 form two different bases for the algebra of symmetric functions, the transition matrix between these being triangular. By analogy, writing our polynomials homogeneously, sums of the χ_S functions could be said to be *elementary symmetric functions*, with the monomials ϕ_S forming the so-called *monomial symmetric functions*, and the upper triangular matrix in the above theorem being the character table of $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$. Inverting upper triangular matrices is done with the aid of the Möbius function [**93**].

We note two points: (1) the age may be an integral domain, without being a polynomial algebra. (2) If it is a polynomial algebra, we are expecting that H be a Weyl group of some type, because only for the symmetric group in its natural action do the invariants form a polynomial algebra (which is generated by symmetric functions).

Consider the induced action of $G = \mathrm{Sym}(m-1)$ on the field of fractions L of $\mathcal{A}^G$, which is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ a number field which is a purely transcendental extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ of transcendence degree n, with G being the group of field automorphisms. Here G is a Galois group and L is a finite Galois extension of the fixed field L^G which also

has transcendental degree n over $\mathbb{Q}$ because the G-action preserves the grading of $\mathcal{A}^G$ by degree.

We have the following links, by expansion of a known schema [**492**, p. 181].



The arrows in this diagram are not inteded to signify functors but our expectation of interesting connections between the fields via theorems extending the results of this section, resulting in a dictionary which would enable us to translate the terminology of one area into those of another.

Recall that K is a number field if the dimension $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$ of K as a vector space over $\mathbb{Q}$ is finite, and K is a Galois extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ giving a Galois group of $K/\mathbb{Q}$ if and only if:

$|\operatorname{Gal}(K/\mathbb{Q})| = |\operatorname{Aut}(K)| = [K : \mathbb{Q}] = \sharp$ of field automorphisms $K \hookrightarrow K$.

Fields have no non-trivial ideals so these homomorphisms are always 1–1. To find number fields that are Galois over $\mathbb{Q}$, factor any $f(X) \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ over $\mathbb{C}$, $f(X) = a(X-\alpha_1)(X-\alpha_2)\dots(X-\alpha_n)$, letting $K = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ be the smallest subfield of $\mathbb{C}$ containing these α_is. For $\sigma : K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we firstly have that $\sigma(K) = K$ (showing that K is Galois over $\mathbb{Q}$) and also the $\sigma(\alpha_i)$ are roots of $f(X)$. The field K is the *splitting field* of $f(X)$ over $\mathbb{Q}$ if and only if it is a Galois extension, that is $\sigma(\alpha) \in K, \forall \sigma$. There is a Galois group action $\operatorname{Gal}(K/\mathbb{Q})$ on the abelian group of K-rational points on a cubic curve, given by $C(K) = \{(x, y) : x, y \in K, and\ y^2 = x^3 + ax^2 + bx + c\} \cup \mathfrak{O}$, where $\mathfrak{O}$ is the point at infinity.

Natural open questions arise; is there any *graph-theoretical* significance to the reducts being Galois groups? For example, is $S_{m,n}$ a Galois group over $\mathbb{Q}$ in a way that is related to its definition?

In our work, the interesting groups are often infinite and a description of the relevant Galois theory appears in an appendix to [**510**]. The groups $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ are profinite and therefore Galois for each m but they are infinite so realizing their Galois action is not straightforward. One way to proceed in principle is to take $[\Gamma_n]$ as an equivalence class

of n-vertex graphs on a fixed number $m \geq 3$ of colours and to define $\mathcal{S} := \bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty}[\Gamma_n]$ as a ring of scalars in which the Γ_n are formal symbols. Then $\mathcal{S}[x,\ldots] = \bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty}[\Gamma_n][x,\ldots]$ is a ring of polynomials in as many variables as we wish. As each element of a *finite subgroup* of $S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$ acts on a set of graphs, dually it permutes the roots of the polynomials.

We will stick with this theme and make some further comments to end the section.

From Theorem 2.10, for $m > 2$, the group $S_{m,n}$ acts transitively on the set $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$ of m-edge-coloured graphs on n vertices, and it follows that all coloured graphs on a fixed number n of vertices are equivalent from the viewpoint of switchings. This leads to the possiblity of a 'Switching Ring' $\mathcal{SR}$ whose elements are the equivalence classes of switching-equivalent graphs which we denote $[\Gamma]$.

Firstly we can form a *semiring* using addition of sets of equivalence classes in the semiring to be the natural addition of commutative monoid coefficients

$$\sum_i \alpha_i[\Gamma_i] + \sum_i \beta_i[\Gamma_i] = \sum_i (\alpha_i + \beta_i)[\Gamma_i],$$

where Γ_i are the multicoloured graph basis elements. We use addition of vertex sets for multiplication, inducing a map $[\Gamma_i] \times [\Gamma_j] \to [\Gamma_{i+j}]$, where we do not have to define a colouring rule for the edges of the product graph because all graphs on a given number of vertices are equivalent and so $[\Gamma_{i+j}]$ is independent of the choice of representatives of $[\Gamma_i]$ and $[\Gamma_j]$. (Other examples of semirings are: (1) $\mathbb{N}[x]$ = polynomials on a generator x with natural number coefficients forming a free commutative semiring; (2) the ideals of a ring under addition and multiplication of ideals). Each element of our semiring is a formal sum of n-vertex multicoloured graphs, where two graphs with different numbers of vertices are taken to be linearly independent in the basis.

The zero coefficient gives the additive and multiplicative semiring zero and the *empty graph* $\Gamma_0 = (V(\Gamma) = \varnothing, E(\Gamma) = \varnothing)$ on no vertices and (therefore) no edges is defined to be the multiplicative identity. From this follows additive associativity and commutativity, multiplicative associativity and left and right distributivity of multiplication over addition. We further assume multiplication to be commutative giving us a commutative semiring of graph equivalence classes.

In order to define the stronger concept of rings of graphs, we turn the commutative monoid (on $+$) that we have thus far formed into an abelian group by allowing additive inverses of the graphs. There

are many ways to do this, for example using the inverses in the coefficient ring (or field). This approach merely reproduces the theories of polynomial rings (or algebras) over one variable.

5.5. PROPOSITION. *The ring* $\bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{Z}[\Gamma_n] \cong \mathbb{Z}[x]$

PROOF. With the homomorphism $[\Gamma_i] \mapsto x^i$ addition is clear and multiplication follows from $x^i \times x^j = x^{i+j}$. The map reverses, giving the result. □

5.6. PROPOSITION. *The ring* $\bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{Q}[\Gamma_n] \cong \mathbb{Q}[x]$

PROOF. Defining multiplication by $[\Gamma_i] \times [\Gamma_j] = \binom{i+j}{i} [\Gamma_{i+j}]$ in the domain algebra. Then the map $[\Gamma_i] \mapsto x^i/i!$ is an isomorphism because $x^i/i! \cdot x^j/j! = \binom{i+j}{i} x^{i+j}/(i+j)!$ □

The following result can be deduced from the last proposition.

5.7. COROLLARY. *Let G be the automorphism group of the countable homogeneous switching class, and let $\mathcal{A}^G$ denote the algebra which encodes information about the action of G on finite subsets of equivalence classes. Then*

(a) G is highly transitive, so $\mathcal{A}^G \cong \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{Sym}(x)}$

(b) $\mathcal{A}^G$ is the graph equivalence class algebra with multiplication defined in Proposition 5.6.

This suggests the following [**99**, p. 120]:

Open Question Given that for graphs on two colours, the finite two-graphs form a Fraïssé class, denoting the automorphism group of the countable homogeneous two-graph by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}(\mathfrak{R}))$, is $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}(\mathfrak{R}))}$ a polynomial algebra?

2. An Isomorphism of Two Algebras

Two relational structures with the same age have the same algebra up to isomorphism of graded algebras, hence the name *age algebra*. In fact the homogeneous components are indexed by an age of the appropriate size and so algebras built out of the age are equal and not just isomorphic. The converse is not true.

In this section we will find an isomorphism between two algebras with very different structures in the finite algebra case, one graded and the other semisimple, and see how an isomorphism arises between them in the infinite case.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a relational structure on a set X, finite or infinite. For any natural number n, let V_n denote the vector space of all functions from n-element subsets of X to $\mathbb{C}$ which are constant on isomorphism classes of n-element substructures of $\mathcal{M}$, and let

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} V_n.$$

There are two ways to define multiplication on $\mathcal{A}$; each turns it into a commutative and associative algebra.

- Cameron: For $f \in V_n$, $g \in V_m$, put
$$(f \circ g)(Y) = \sum \{f(U)g(V) : U \cup V = Y, U \cap V = \varnothing\}.$$
- Glynn: For $f \in V_n$, $g \in V_m$, put
$$(f * g)(Y) = \sum \{f(U)g(V) : U \cup V = Y\}.$$

In the case where X is finite, these algebras are very different. Cameron's is graded (since the product of elements of V_n and V_m is non-zero only on sets of cardinality $m+n$, and so belongs to V_{n+m}), but any element with V_0 component zero is nilpotent (indeed $f^N = 0$ if $N > |X|$).

Glynn's algebra is not graded (the displayed product fg can have non-zero components in V_k for $\max(n, m) \leq k \leq n+m$), but is semisimple and commutative. Glynn's construction [**246**] of rings of geometries (the term geometry includes graphs, matrices, projective planes, and many other combinatorial structures), in which addition is disjoint union and multiplication of graphs Γ_i, Γ_j on vertices n_i, n_j is defined by $\Gamma_i \times \Gamma_j = \sum \mu_{ij}^k \Gamma_k$ where μ_{ij}^k is the number of ways of writing $\Gamma_k = \gamma_i \cup \gamma_j$ where $\gamma_i \cong \Gamma_i$ and $\gamma_j \cong \Gamma_j$. Here $\mu_{ij}^k \neq 0 \Rightarrow \max(n_i, n_j) \leq |\Gamma_k| \leq n_i + n_j$. His ring is defined on any closed set of geometries with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$ and the geometries as basis elements; coefficients in a field would instead give an algebra. The semisimplicity arises from the fact that each geometry in a finite closed set of them corresponds to a homomorphism to $\mathbb{Z}$ and to a principal idempotent of the ring, and these idempotents are pairwise orthogonal [**246**, Theorem 2.5]. A closed set of n geometries is isomorphic to the direct sum of $\mathbb{Z}$, n times.

We begin by investigating the very simplest infinite case, that where $\mathcal{M}$ has no structure at all, consisting simply of the set X. In this case, V_n is 1-dimensional, spanned by the constant function f_n on n-sets with value 1. In either algebra, we have

$$f_1^n = n!\, f_n + \text{lower terms},$$

(the lower terms are absent in Cameron's case), so the algebra is a polynomial algebra in one variable, generated by f_1.

We calculate explicitly an isomorphism from Glynn's algebra to Cameron's in this case. Such an isomorphism θ will be of the form

$$\theta(f_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{n,i} f_i,$$

with $a_{n,n} = 1$ for all n. We have

$$f_n * f_1 = (n+1) f_{n+1} + n f_n, \qquad f_n \circ f_1 = (n+1) f_{n+1}.$$

Hence we have

$$(n+1)\theta(f_{n+1}) + n\theta(f_n) = \theta(f_n * f_1) = \theta(f_n) \circ \theta(f_1) = \theta(f_n) \circ f_1.$$

Thus, we find the recurrence relation

$$(n+1)a_{n+1,i} = i a_{n,i-1} - n a_{n,i},$$

with the convention that $a_{n,0} = a_{n,n+1} = 0$.

We find easily that $a_{n,n} = 1$ and $a_{n,1} = (-1)^{n-1}/n$. For $n \le 6$, computation gives the following results:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & & & \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & & & & \\ \frac{1}{3} & -1 & 1 & & & \\ -\frac{1}{4} & \frac{11}{12} & -\frac{3}{2} & 1 & & \\ \frac{1}{5} & -\frac{5}{6} & \frac{7}{4} & -2 & 1 & \\ -\frac{1}{6} & \frac{137}{180} & -\frac{15}{8} & \frac{17}{6} & -\frac{5}{2} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The inverse of this matrix (giving the reverse isomorphism) is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & & & \\ \frac{1}{2} & 1 & & & & \\ \frac{1}{6} & 1 & 1 & & & \\ \frac{1}{24} & \frac{7}{12} & \frac{3}{2} & 1 & & \\ \frac{1}{120} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{5}{4} & 2 & 1 & \\ \frac{1}{720} & \frac{31}{360} & \frac{3}{4} & \frac{13}{6} & \frac{5}{2} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Inspection of the numbers reveals that in the second matrix, modulo a small shift, the pattern is of Stirling numbers of the second kind, and in the first matrix Stirling numbers of the first kind, the two families of Stirling numbers being mutual inverses. In fact normalizing the numbers by multiplying by the highest common multiple, we arrive at the Triangle of Numbers $T(n,k) = k!S(n,k)$ read by rows $(n \ge 1, 1 \le k < n)$ (sequence A019538 in [**494**]), where $S(n,k)$ is the Stirling number of the second kind.

The reason for the occurrence of the $S(n,k)$ is that the overlapping terms in Glynn's algebra (that is the terms $a_{n,k}$ in $\theta(f_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{n,k} f_k$) are combinatorially precisely the same as having indistinct elements in G-orbits on k-tuples in an implied wreath product action and resulting

fibre bundle, where each $a_{n,k}$ term is the number of partitions of the n-th fibre with k parts. The group action, say $G \operatorname{Wr} H$ acting on a set $X \times Y$ producing the partitions is implied, and the k parts in a fibre are the "connected" subsets, i.e. connected graphs. That the Stirling numbers occur in a lower triangular matrix is obviously because $k \leq n$. Since orbits and partitions are equivalent, the equation $\theta(f_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{n,k} f_k$ is equivalent to the appearance of the Stirling numbers of the second kind that are the entries of the transition matrix in $F_n^* = \sum_{k=1}^{n} S(n,k) F_k$; (see Appendix 12).

More generally, assume as we found above, that f_n is a linear function of $f_1 \dots f_{n-1}$ for all n. By induction,

$$\begin{aligned}(\bullet) \times f_n &= (\bullet) \times \phi_1(f_1, \dots, f_n) \\ &= \phi_0(f_{n+1}, \phi_1(f_1, \dots, f_n)) \\ &= \phi_0(f_{n+1}, \phi_1(f_1, \dots, f_n), \phi_2(f_1, \dots, f_{n-1})) \\ &= \dots \\ &= \phi_0(f_{n+1}, \phi_1(f_1, \dots, f_n), \phi_2(f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}), \dots, \phi_{n-1}(f_1, f_2)),\end{aligned}$$

where each of $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{n-1}$ are previously determined functions with known coefficients as in the above matrices, and the leading f_{n+1} terms in the ϕ_0 expression is identical for the Cameron and Glynn algebras.

We conclude that

5.8. Theorem. *In the limit of infinite pure point sets without any structure, the Cameron algebra and the Glynn algebra are isomorphic.*

Can we find an isomorphism between the Cameron and Glynn algebras for more general structures? In the setting of vector spaces over finite fields, the Gaussian (or q-binomial) coefficient plays the role of Stirling numbers. Thus there may be a vector space version of the algebra isomorphism.

The next case to study is that of two infinite sets with a direct product of symmetric groups $\operatorname{Sym}(\infty) \times \operatorname{Sym}(\infty)$, but we leave this for the interested reader.

The question as to whether or not there is an algebra isomorphism in the case of graphs is open. We have not attempted a full proof in the case of graphs but we realize the local isomorphism for graphs of up to three vertices in the appendix to this chapter. Either algebra can be defined for graphs in general or for random graphs in particular. We know that the Cameron algebra is a polynomial ring in infinitely many

variables (corresponding to connected graphs for $\mathfrak{R}$, or graphs which are connected when a distinguished colour is made transparent for $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$.) The former has been studied, see for example the first section of this chapter and references therein; we do not think that Glynn's algebra has been looked at in this case.

As we saw in the first section of this chapter, homogeneous structures have invariant rings that are polynomial rings, where the homogeneous generators are the characteristic functions of the "connected" structures in the age; therefore they are integral domains.

Inexhaustibility

As we mentioned earlier in the book, there are constructions of non-isomorphic structures with equal ages [**187**]. However two homogeneous structures with isomorphic ages are isomorphic [**90**]; (note that this is no longer true if the structures are just $\aleph_0$-categorical).

An *inexhaustible homogeneous structure* $\mathcal{M}$ is one for which $\mathcal{M}\backslash A \cong \mathcal{M}$, for all finite $A \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, or equivalently, $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})_A$ has only finite orbits. The notion of *inexhaustible* relational structures originates in Fraïssé's work [**220**].

El-Zahar and Sauer studied [**195**] Ramsey-type properties of infinite relational structures, connecting different types of indivisibility and inexhaustibility. Böröczky, Sauer and Zhu further studied [**69**] variations on the theme of inexhaustibility. They show that *inexhaustible* $\Rightarrow$ *weakly inexhaustible* $\Rightarrow$ *age-inexhaustible* $\Rightarrow$ *closure-inexhaustible*; see their paper for definitions of these and other related concepts. For an infinite structure on an infinite domain, the age of $\mathcal{M}$ is *inexhaustible* if given any two finite substructures of $\mathcal{M}$, is it possible to find disjoint copies of them within $\mathcal{M}$. A homogeneous structure is age-inexhaustible if and only if all orbits of the empty set $A = \varnothing$ are infinite, such as for the Cameron algebra. For finite languages weakly inexhaustible and age-inexhaustible are equivalent, and in the language of graphs, closure-inexhaustible is also equivalent. For infinite languages the hierarchy is strict.

If $\mathcal{M}$ encodes $G = \mathrm{Sym}(X)$, then $\ker(\mathcal{M})$ is the union of the finite G-orbits of the 1-element sets, so if G has no finite orbit then $\ker(\mathcal{M}) = \varnothing$, and $\mathcal{A}^G$ is an integral domain. Pouzet showed [**440**] that the age algebra $\mathbb{C}\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ of $\mathcal{M}$ is an integral domain if and only if $\mathcal{M}$ is age-inexhaustible. The amalgamation condition for weakly inexhaustible structures is strong amalgamation, where the ages on labelled and unlabelled structures are the same (see Appendix 4 and [**87**]).

We can now state a conjecture:

5.9. Conjecture. *If $\mathcal{M}$ is an age-inexhaustible relational structure then the Cameron and Glynn algebras are isomorphic.*

Earlier in the section we proved the conjecture for sets with no structure (or equivalently for $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$) using Stirling numbers. The case of groups, for example $G = \mathrm{Sym}(X)$, is a special case of that of relational structures. We shall prove the converse of this conjecture, finding it instructive nevertheless to give the argument for the group case separately. For we shall show in the case of both groups and relational structures, that if $\mathcal{M}$ is not age-inexhaustible then there is a finite set S consisting of all points of some given type. So if f is a characteristic function of S then $f^2 = 0$ in the Cameron algebra, but the Glynn algebra for finite sets, being semisimple has no nonzero nilpotent elements.

Group Case:

A statement of the conjecture in the case of a group G is: if G has no finite orbits then the Cameron and Glynn algebras are isomorphic.

To prove that the converse is true, let S be a finite orbit and let f its characteristic function so that $f^2 = 0$ in the Cameron algebra, as is proved in previous work on this subject, see [**105**] and references therein. We need to show that the Glynn algebra never contains such elements. Let $G = \mathrm{Sym}(X)$ so that the algebra is spanned by $f_0, f_1, f_2, \ldots$, where f_k is the characteristic function of the set of all k-sets. Then

$$\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k f_k\Big)\Big(\sum_{k'=1}^{m} b_{k'} f_{k'}\Big), \quad a_n, b_m \neq 0$$

has a term $a_n b_m f_{n+m} \neq 0$ and lower terms. For $f \neq 0$, write $f = \sum a_i f_{(k,i)}$, where $f_{(k,i)}$ is the characteristic function of some orbit of G on k-sets. Then $f^2 = \sum a_i b_j f_{(k,i)} f_{(l,j)}$, and the argument goes through.

Relational Structure Case:

A statement of the conjecture in the case of a group G is: if $\mathcal{M}$ is not an age-inexhaustible relational structure then the Cameron and Glynn algebras are not isomorphic.

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for each isomorphism type T_i of k-element substructures of $\mathcal{M}$, let $f_{k,i}$ be the characteristic function of the set of k-element substructures isomorphic to T_i. Then

$$(f_{k,i} \star f_{l,j})(S) = \sharp(S_1, S_2) : S_1 \cup S_2 = S,$$

where $f_{k,i}(T_1) \neq 0, f_{k,j}(T_2) \neq 0, S_1 \in T_1, S_2 \in T_2$. (In the case of the Cameron algebra there would be the the additional condition that $S_1 \cap S_2 = \varnothing$). Extend linearly to the span of all such terms.

We claim that if $U \subseteq X = \mathrm{dom}(\mathcal{M})$, then we find that the Glynn algebra of $\mathcal{M}_{|U}$, not necessarily a subalgebra, but $(f_{k,i} \star f_{l,j})(U)$ is the same in this smaller algebra than in the whole algebra.

Suppose that $f^2 = 0$. Then take any subset U for which $f_{|U} \neq 0$, $f_{|U}^2 = 0$. This meets the hypotheses of Glynn's algebra, but gives us a contradiction as in the finite case this algebra is semisimple and has no nilpotent elements.

Growth Rates and Reconstruction

The algebraic considerations of this section are related to vertex reconstruction [**99**] [**100**] [**443**]; (see Appendix 12). We end the chapter by stating and motivating a conjecture that relates growth rates and reconstruction.

5.10. Conjecture. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a relational structure and let $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$. If $F_n(G)$ is known together with a bound on its growth, then is $\mathcal{M}$ reconstructible.*

What evidence do we have that such a statement might be true?

It is plausible that if growth is not too fast, for example is slower than n^2, then we may be able to prove reconstruction. In the case of polynomial sequence growth, M. Pouzet has a structural characterization of the growth and it is slow enough for the structures to be reconstructible.

If the growth rate is too fast then reconstruction is not possible, for example in the case of n-element structures, reconstruction fails if $f_n > (f_{n-1})^n$, so this represents an upper bound for $(n-1)$-element substructures. Take for instance $f_n = (f_{n-1})^n$ for $n \geq 2$ in the case that $f_1 = 2$ giving $f_n = 2^{n!}$ which is an exponential of an exponential (by Stirling's formula); this is faster than the growth rate for graphs which is merely exponential.

There is probably a band in the middle of these two possibilities where we can ask questions such as

Open Question

Is it true that there are two ages $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ such that $f_n(\mathcal{A}) = f_n(\mathcal{B})$ $\forall n$ whilst $\mathcal{A}$ is reconstructible but $\mathcal{B}$ is not.

Age reconstruction of graphs is equivalent to the reconstruction of the random graph [**120**].

Finally we mention a reference to the Hopf algebras with bases labelled by graphs and hypergraphs, provided with natural embeddings into a polynomial algebra in infinitely many variables, and graded by the number of edges; these algebras can be considered as generalizations of symmetric functions [**420**].

3. Appendix: Cameron & Glynn Algebra Graph Isomorphisms

We will demonstrate an isomorphism between the Cameron and Glynn algebras in Theorem 5.8 for graphs on $1, 2$, and 3 vertices.

The Cameron algebra expression is given first, followed by the 'leads to' symbol $\rightsquigarrow$ and then the equivalent Glynn algebra term. The latter includes smaller terms corresponding to overlapping graphs in Glynn's algebra, with coefficients to be determined. The appropriate isomorphism is defined by mapping an element of the Cameron algebra onto the corresponding Glynn algebra term, by showing that the Glynn coefficients can be assigned unambiguous values.

One and Two vertex graphs

$(\varnothing) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad (\varnothing)$

$(\bullet) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad (\bullet + a \varnothing)$

$\Big((\bullet \text{—} \bullet) \Big) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \Big((\bullet \text{—} \bullet) + b \bullet + c \varnothing \Big)$

$\Big((\bullet \quad \bullet) \Big) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \Big((\bullet \quad \bullet) + d \bullet + e \varnothing \Big)$

Together with multiplication rules,

$\bullet \times \varnothing = \bullet$ and $(\bullet \quad \bullet) \times \varnothing = 2\,(\bullet \quad \bullet)$ and $(\bullet \text{—} \bullet) \times \varnothing = 2(\bullet \text{—} \bullet)$

we have that for

Cameron:

$\bullet \times \bullet = 2(\bullet \text{—} \bullet) + 2(\bullet \quad \bullet)$

$\rightsquigarrow$

Glynn:

$(\bullet + a \varnothing) \times (\bullet + a \varnothing) \quad = \quad 2(\bullet \text{—} \bullet) + 2(\bullet \quad \bullet) + \bullet + 2\, a \bullet + a^2 \varnothing$

(The single vertex in the last expression is from the superposition of one vertex on top of another.) But also

$\bullet \times \bullet = 2(\bullet \text{—} \bullet) + 2(\bullet \quad \bullet) \quad \rightsquigarrow$

$2(\bullet \text{—} \bullet) + 2b \bullet + 2c\varnothing \quad + \quad 2(\bullet \quad \bullet) + 2d \bullet + 2e\varnothing \,.$

So

$$2a + 1 = 2b + 2d$$
$$a^2 = 2c + 2e.$$

One possible isomorphism is found by setting $a = -\frac{1}{2}$ in order to eliminate the single-vertex terms on the right-hand side, giving

$\bullet \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \bullet - \frac{1}{2} \varnothing$

$(\bullet \text{—} \bullet) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad (\bullet \text{—} \bullet) + b \bullet + c \varnothing$

$(\bullet \quad \bullet) \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad (\bullet \quad \bullet) - b \bullet + e \varnothing$

and thus the isomorphism

$\bullet \times \bullet = 2(\bullet \text{—} \bullet) + 2(\bullet \quad \bullet) \quad \longrightarrow \quad 2(\bullet \text{—} \bullet) + 2(\bullet \quad \bullet) + \frac{1}{4}\varnothing \,.$

A second possible isomorphism retains the single vertex term and eliminates the no-vertex term, as follows. Set

$$a = 0; \quad c = e = 0.$$

Then

$$d = \frac{1}{2} - b.$$

So the isomorphism is

$$\begin{aligned} \bullet \quad &\rightsquigarrow \quad \bullet \\ (\bullet - \bullet) \quad &\rightsquigarrow \quad (\bullet - \bullet) + b\,\bullet \\ (\bullet \quad \bullet) \quad &\rightsquigarrow \quad (\bullet \quad \bullet) + (\tfrac{1}{2} - b)\,\bullet \end{aligned}$$

in turn giving the isomorphism

$$\bullet \times \bullet = 2(\bullet - \bullet) + 2(\bullet \quad \bullet) \quad \longrightarrow \quad 2(\bullet - \bullet) + 2(\bullet \quad \bullet) + \bullet\,.$$

It is this second isomorphism that we will use.

Three vertex graphs

(i) Cameron:

$$\bullet \times (\bullet \quad \bullet)$$

$$= \quad 3\left(\begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & & \bullet \\ & \bullet & \end{array}\right) + 2\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \bullet & \\ \bullet & - & \bullet \end{array}\right) + \left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \bullet & \\ \bullet & & \bullet \end{array}\right)$$

$\rightsquigarrow$

Glynn:

$$(\bullet + a\,\varnothing) \times \big((\bullet \quad \bullet) + d\,\bullet + e\,\varnothing\big)$$

$$= \quad 3\left(\begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & & \bullet \\ & \bullet & \end{array}\right) + 2\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \bullet & \\ \bullet & - & \bullet \end{array}\right) + \left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \bullet & \\ \bullet & & \bullet \end{array}\right)$$

$$+ (ad + e)\varnothing\,(\bullet) + (ae\varnothing^2)$$

$$+ \quad 2\,d\,(\bullet - \bullet) + (2a{+}2d)\,(\bullet \quad \bullet) + d\,(\bullet)$$

Let

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & & \bullet \\ & \bullet & \end{array}\right) \mapsto \left(\begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & & \bullet \\ & \bullet & \end{array}\right) + \alpha\,(\bullet - \bullet) + \alpha'\,(\bullet \quad \bullet) + \alpha''\,(\bullet)$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \bullet & \\ \bullet & - & \bullet \end{array}\right) \mapsto \left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \bullet & \\ \bullet & - & \bullet \end{array}\right) + \beta\,(\bullet - \bullet) + \beta'\,(\bullet \quad \bullet) + \beta''\,(\bullet)$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \bullet & \\ \bullet & & \bullet \end{array}\right) \mapsto \left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \bullet & \\ \bullet & & \bullet \end{array}\right) + \gamma\,(\bullet - \bullet) + \gamma'\,(\bullet \quad \bullet) + \gamma''\,(\bullet)$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \bullet & \\ \bullet & - & \bullet \end{array}\right) \mapsto \left(\begin{array}{ccc} & \bullet & \\ \bullet & - & \bullet \end{array}\right) + \delta\,(\bullet - \bullet) + \delta'\,(\bullet \quad \bullet) + \delta''\,(\bullet)$$

So



But we have already set $a = e = 0$. Matching up coefficients leaves us with only three non-zero ones, $\alpha = 2d$, $\alpha' = 2d + 2a$, $\alpha'' = d$, where as previously determined

$$d = \frac{1}{2} - b.$$

(In the next step we shall see that $b = 0,\ d = \frac{1}{2}$).

(ii) Cameron:



Glynn:



since $a = 0 = c$. The single vertex term comes from the overlap of the two single vertices.

We can eliminate the single vertex term by setting $b = 0$. Then $d = \frac{1}{2}$ in the previous calculation.

As a check, notice that if we define the local Glynn maps by



then on the one hand



and on the other hand



In order to match up the two expressions, we must take $b = 0$, and then we must set $x = y = z = 0$.

(iii) Cameron:



Glynn:



where the subsidiary terms vanish as we have already set $a = 0$.

Note that in all three above cases, the no-vertex and single vertex terms have been eliminated, as we required.

The above method can in principle be continued to obtain further isomorphisms. There is a separate combinatorial problem of how many graphs can be fitted into a larger graph on a given vertex set, and one approach to its resolution is as follows.

Denoting the number of i-vertex graphs that can be embedded as induced subgraphs of a j-vertex graph ($j \geq i$) by a double angled bracket, we have that

$$\langle\!\langle \Gamma_j : \Gamma_i \rangle\!\rangle = \sum \langle\!\langle \Gamma_j : \Gamma_{j-1} \rangle\!\rangle \langle\!\langle \Gamma_{j-1} : \Gamma_i \rangle\!\rangle \tag{2}$$

$$= \left[\binom{j-1}{j-1} + \ldots + \binom{j-1}{2} + \binom{j-1}{1} \right] \langle\!\langle \Gamma_{j-1} : \Gamma_i \rangle\!\rangle \tag{3}$$

where the sum is over all $j-1$ vertex graphs. This gives a recursive combinatorial expression, with the possible use of the following known identities:-

(1) the recurrence relation for Bell numbers:
$\mathrm{Bn}_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \binom{n-1}{k-1} \mathrm{Bn}_{n-k} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} S(n,k)$,

(2) $\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-1}{k}$,

(3) $L(n,k) = \binom{n-1}{k-1} \frac{n!}{k!}$; $\quad L(n,k+1) = \frac{n-k}{k(k+1)} L(n,k)$; $\quad$ and
$(-1)^n L(n,k) = \sum_z (-1)^z s(n,k) S(n,k)$,

where the unsigned Lah number $L(n,k)$ counts the number of ways a set of n elements can be partitioned into k nonempty linearly ordered subsets, and $s(n,k)$ is the Stirling number of the first kind.

CHAPTER 6

Random Graphs as Homogeneous Cayley Objects

It has been observed frequently in mathematics that apparently unrelated theories can lead to the same special objects. This often indicates a potential for new relationships yielding further development of these theories.

Frenkel, Lepowsky and Meurman, from the Introduction to
Vertex Operator Algebras and the Monster

The Eight Immortals of Chinese mythology ... are not strictly speaking, gods. They are legendary personages who became immortal .... These eight characters have nothing in common, and it is hard to say how the Taoists came to make them into an almost inseparable group.

New Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology

The flask of oil lasted for eight days. Eight is a significant number. If six stands for the physical creation and seven for the spiritual in the midst of the physical (Shabbat), then eight stands for that which is completely outside our world. It stands for the World to Come.

E. E. Dessler, Sanctuaries in Time, 1994

The Eightfold Path is the Buddhist Manual to Self-Enlightenment. Much of it is to be found in other religions and philosophies ....

C. Humphreys, Buddhism, 1954, p.108

The Fathers of the Mishnah ... were not fantastic fools, but subtle philosophers, discovering the reign of universal law through the exceptions, the miracles that had to be created specially and were still a part of the order of the world, bound to appear in due time much as apparently erratic comets are.

I. Zangwill

1. $\mathfrak{R}$ as a Cayley Graph

A graph admits a regular action of a group if and only if it is a Cayley graph for the group. In this first section we turn our attention to the two-coloured random graph, recalling Cameron's construction of $\mathfrak{R}$ as a Cayley Graph and deriving results allied to the following [**103**]:

6.1. THEOREM. *$\mathfrak{R}$ admits $2^{\aleph_0}$ pairwise non-conjugate cyclic automorphisms.*

It is a corollary of this result that the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ has uncountably many non-conjugate cyclic automorphisms that the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ of the random graph has uncountable order. It is also possible to reach this conclusion by viewing $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ as a Polish group.

The proof of this theorem uses the construction of $\mathfrak{R}$ as a Cayley graph $\Gamma(S)$, $S \subset \mathbb{N}$, whose vertices are integers, and an edge $x \sim y$ is formed for $x, y \in \Gamma(S) \Leftrightarrow |x - y| \in S$. The cyclic shift $x \mapsto x + 1$ is an automorphism of $\Gamma(S)$. For each S $(= \{x > 0 : x \sim 0\})$ form a graph $\Gamma(S)$, and if $S_1 \neq S_2$ but $\Gamma(S_1) \cong \Gamma(S_2)$, then the corresponding cyclic shifts are non-conjugate graph automorphisms for a countable graph Γ; (see Fact 2 below). There is a natural bijection between countable zero-one sequences $s = s_1 s_2 \ldots$ and $\{S\}$. Furthermore $\Gamma(S) \cong \mathfrak{R}$ if and only if this characteristic function of S is *universal*, that is, any finite zero-one sequence occurs as a consecutive subsequence. A random zero-one sequence is universal with probability 1 because a given sequence σ of length k has positive probability 2^{-k} of occurring in k given consecutive positions, and we can find infinitely many disjoint sets of consecutive positions.

That $\mathfrak{R}$ has cyclic automorphisms shows that it is a Cayley graph for the infinite cyclic group. It follows from the theorem that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ has $2^{\aleph_0}$ conjugacy classes of regular subgroups. An m-valued characteristic function in the above construction would give $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$.

This method can be extended to find all the possible cycle structures for automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$. For example, there cannot be an automorphism which has one fixed point and permutes the others in a single cycle, since this would force the fixed point to be joined to all or no other vertices. However, there is an automorphism which fixes a point and permutes the remaining vertices in two cycles (one for neighbours, and one for non-neighbours, of the fixed point).

From the construction of cyclic automorphisms, we see that $\mathfrak{R}$ has a two-way infinite Hamiltonian path. (Choose a universal set containing 1; then v_n is joined to v_{n+1} for all n.)

We will now use the following way of stating the *universality* of the set S, namely that given any finite zero-one sequence $(e_0, \ldots, e_{n-1})$, there exists a natural number N such that, for $0 \le i \le n-1$, $N+i \in S$ if and only if $e_i = 1$.

Fact 1 $\Gamma(S) \cong \mathfrak{R}$ *if and only if* S *is universal.*

PROOF. Suppose that S is universal. Let U and V be finite disjoint sets of vertices. Let $n = \max(U \cup V) - \min(U \cup V) + 1, r = \max(U \cup V)$. For $0 \le i \le n-1$, let $e_i = 1$ if $r - i \in U$, $e_i = 0$ if $r - i \in V$, and choose arbitrarily whether e_i is 0 or 1 if $r - i \notin U \cup V$. Choose N such that $N + i \in S$ if and only if $e_i = 1$ (by universality). Now $N + i = |(N + r) - (r - i)|$, so $N + r \sim r - i$ for $r - i \in U$ and $N + r \not\sim r - i$ if $r - i \in V$. Thus $N + r$ witnesses property $(*)$ for (U, V).

Conversely, suppose that $\Gamma(S) \cong \mathfrak{R}$; we have to show that S is universal, so suppose that s is a finite zero-one sequence of length n, say. Let $s^\dagger$ denote the reversal of s, and t the concatenation of s with $s^\dagger$. Now let $U = \{i : t_i = 1\}$ and $V = \{i : t_i = 0\}$. There exists a witness z for $(*)$ for the pair (U, V), and by reversing the previous argument we see that z gives rise to a subsequence t in the characteristic function of S if it is negative, and $t^\dagger$ if is at least $2n$. In either case, s is realized. □

Fact 2 *Let* Γ_1 *and* Γ_2 *be countable graphs admitting cyclic automorphisms* σ_1 *and* σ_2. *Choose any vertex* v_i *of* Γ_i, *and let*

$$S_i = \{m > 0 : v_i^{\sigma_i^m} \sim v_i\}$$

for $i = 1, 2$. *Then the set* S_i *does not depend on the choice of* v_i. *Moreover,* $S_1 = S_2$ *if and only* $\Gamma_1 \cong \Gamma_2$ *and these graphs can be identified so that* σ_1 *and* σ_2 *are conjugate in the automorphism group.*

PROOF. Since every vertex w_i of Γ_i is of the form $v_i^{\sigma_i^r}$ for some r, we see using the fact that σ_i is an automorphism that

$$w_i \sim w_i^{\sigma_i^m} \Leftrightarrow v_i^{\sigma_i^r} \sim v_i^{\sigma_i^{m+r}} \Leftrightarrow v_i \sim v_i^{\sigma_i^m}.$$

So the set S_i is independent of the choice of v_i.

A very similar argument shows that if σ_i is replaced by a conjugate automorphism then the same set S_i is obtained.

Now clearly $\Gamma_i \cong \Gamma(S_i)$ (with the earlier notation). If $S_1 \cong S_2$, then clearly $\Gamma_1 \cong \Gamma_2$. Moreover, the isomorphism between them conjugates σ_1 to σ_2. The converse is clear from the preceding remark. □

Fact 3 *The set of universal subsets of* $\mathbb{N}$ *is of full measure and residual.*

PROOF. The occurence of a fixed zero-one sequence in the characteristic function of S is clearly of full measure, open and dense. There are only countably many such finite sequences. □

The phenomenon of chaos has several characteristic features. One is sensitivity to initial conditions and another is randomness. In the study of the symbolic dynamics of the horseshoe function, there arises the set of all sequences as maps to a 2-element set $\mathbb{Z} \to \{0, 1\}$ [**34**]. If σ is a function on the set of sequences that shifts each entry to the left by one position, then the sequence $\ldots 00000000 \ldots$ will be a fixed point for σ, and $\ldots 01010101 \ldots$ will have period 2, and $\ldots 10010001 \ldots$ is not periodic. S. Smale has shown that all the dynamics of σ are embedded in the horseshoe, so shares the latter's infinite number of targets (and also periodic points though this point is irrelevant for us), and the existence of initial states with random orbits. The randomness of the horseshoe is thus at least to some small extent encoded in the randomness of the Cayley graph of $\mathfrak{R}$. We must qualify this statement by noting that because *almost all* sequences give a graph isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ there will be $2^{\aleph_0}$ exceptions, but these form a null (respectively meagre) set in the sense of measure (respectively category). Some examples of exceptions are (i) the sequence $10101010 \ldots$ with the edge-formation rule involves joining x to y if $|x-y|$ is odd yields the complete bipartite graph, the two blocks being the odd numbers and the even numbers; (ii) the sequence $01010101 \ldots$ with the joining rule join x to y if $|x-y|$ is even yields the disjoint union of two complete graphs, one on the odd numbers and the other on the even numbers; (iii) sequences σ_n which are zero when n is even and 0 or 1 randomly if n is odd give almost surely the random bipartite graph. Placing a 1 at the zeroth position of the above sequences corresponds to a vertex with a loop.

The construction of a graph Γ as a Cayley graph given in [**103**] has that $\Gamma = \mathrm{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}, S \cup (-S))$, where the vertex set is $\mathbb{Z}$ and $x \sim y \Leftrightarrow |x - y| \in S$ for all subsets $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$. Then $x \sim y \Leftrightarrow (x + 1) \sim (y + 1)$ and so $\mathfrak{R}$ admits a cyclic shift as an automorphism. Let σ_S be the automorphism of $\mathfrak{R}$ obtained by identifying $\mathfrak{R}$ with $\mathrm{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}, S \cup (-S))$. Suppose $\sigma_S \sim \sigma_{S'}$ in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$. Then there is an automorphism β of $\mathfrak{R}$ such that $\sigma_{S'} = \beta^{-1}\sigma_S\beta$; (see Fact 2 above). Pictorially we have that

Recall that a permutation σ of $\mathfrak{R}$ is an *almost automorphism* if the set of unordered pairs of vertices $\{\{x, y\} \in [\mathfrak{R}]^2 : f\{\sigma x, \sigma y\} \neq f\{x, y\}\}$ where $f : [\mathfrak{R}]^2 \to \{\text{edge, non-edge}\}$ is finite.

The set of almost automorphisms form a group. Two conjugate cyclic automorphisms in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ stay conjugate in $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$. Now we



FIGURE 1. Automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$

are going to prove the converse, that is that two almost automorphisms never become conjugate,

6.2. THEOREM. *The $2^{\aleph_0}$ cyclic automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$ that are non-conjugate in the group* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$*, remain non-conjugate in the group* $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ *of almost automorphisms.*

PROOF. Suppose $\sigma' = \beta^{-1}\sigma\beta$ where $\beta \in \mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ (as opposed to $\beta \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ thus far). Put $y_n = x_n\beta$ and $\sigma' : y_n \mapsto y_{n+1}$. Take any $s \in S$. There are infinitely many pairs m, n with $|m - n| \in S$, that is $x_m \sim x_n$. Only finitely many edges are destroyed by β. So $\exists m, n$ such that $|m - n| \in S$, with $y_m \sim y_n$. So $s = |m - n| \in S'$.

A similar argument goes through for non-edges showing that $s \notin S \Rightarrow s \notin S'$. Therefore $S = S'$. □

The essence of the above argument is that there are infinitely many pairs m, n for which $|m - n|$ is any given positive integer r. If $r \in S$ then $m \sim n$ for all such pairs; if $r \notin S$ then $m \sim n$ for none. We cannot change one case to the other by adjusting only finitely many edges.

6.3. COROLLARY. $\mathfrak{R}$ *admits cyclic almost automorphisms which are not automorphisms.*

PROOF. Let σ to be a cyclic automorphism of $\mathfrak{R}$. Take a suitable almost automorphism β and calculate $\beta^{-1}\sigma\beta$. This is a cyclic almost automorphism, because σ is cyclic and it is also the product of almost automorphisms. We need to show for suitable choice of β, that it is not an automorphism. Suppose $\{1, 2\}$ is an edge and $\beta : \{1, 2\} \to \{1^\beta, 2^\beta\}$, where $\{1^\beta, 2^\beta\}$ is a non-edge and preserves all other adjacencies. Then, $\{1^\beta, 2^\beta\}^{\beta^{-1}\sigma\beta} = \{2^\beta, 3^\beta\}$. But $\{2, 3\}$ is an edge, being the image of $\{1, 2\}$ under σ. Therefore $\{2^\beta, 3^\beta\}$ is an edge, since β preserves all adjacencies other than $\{1, 2\}$. Therefore $\beta^{-1}\sigma\beta$ is not an automorphism. □

We have an example of an even stronger proposition - that $\mathfrak{R}$ admits cyclic almost automorphisms which are not conjugate to automorphisms in $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

Let S be a subset of the natural numbers $\mathbb{N}$, so that we have an isomorphism between $\mathrm{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}, S \cup (-S))$ and $\mathfrak{R}$. As we noted in the paragraph after the statement of Theorem 6.1, this is true if and only if the characteristic function corresponding to S is universal. Then $S \setminus \{1\}$ is also universal. Define a graph Γ with vertex set $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $m \sim n$ if and only if either

- $|m-n| \in S$, $|m-n| > 1$; or
- $|m-n| = 1$, $m, n \geq 0$.

This is the Cayley graph of $\mathbb{Z}$ with respect to S, with the "negative half" of one cycle of edges removed.

Claim 1: $\Gamma \cong \mathfrak{R}$. Given U, V, there are infinitely many z correctly joined in $\mathrm{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}, S)$, and certainly only finitely many of them can differ from an element of $U \cup V$ by one.

Claim 2: The shift $g : n \to n+1$ is almost an automorphism. For the non-edge $\{-1, 0\}$ is mapped to the edge $\{0, 1\}$; but all other adjacencies are preserved.

Claim 3: g is not conjugate to an automorphism. For consider $h^{-1}gh$, where h is an arbitrary almost automorphism. This maps nh to $(n+1)h$. If it were an automorphism then $mh \sim nh$ if and only if $|m-n| \in T$ for some set T. But since h is an almost automorphism we find $S = T = S \setminus \{1\}$, a contradiction.

An alternative argument for Claim 3: Let a be an automorphism, and h an almost automorphism. Let $C(g)$ be the set of adjacencies changed by the almost automorphism g. Then $C(h^{-1}ah)$ is the symmetric difference of $C(h^{-1})$ and $C(h)a^{-1}h$. (For if e is any pair of vertices and if $e \in C(h^{-1})$ then e is changed by h^{-1}, and if $eh^{-1}a \in C(h)$ then the image of e under $h^{-1}a$ is changed by h; if it is changed twice, it goes back to its original state). Since these two sets have the same size, $C(h^{-1}ah)$ has even cardinality. But since $C(g)$ is a singleton, g cannot be conjugate to an automorphism.

Cyclic automorphisms of the random graph are investigated using methods of Baire category and measure theory in [**84**].

Recall that Henson's graph $\mathfrak{H}_k$ contains no K_k but has all finite K_k-free graphs as induced subgraphs. Henson observed that whilst $\mathfrak{H}_3$ admits cyclic automorphisms, the graphs $\mathfrak{H}_k$ $(k \geq 4)$ do not. For these cyclic automorphisms, observe that $\Gamma(S)$ is triangle-free if and only if S is sum-free. A set S of natural numbers is said to be *sum-free*, if, for all $x, y \in S$, we have $x + y \notin S$. The obvious example is the set of odd numbers. Schur [**476**] proved that the natural numbers cannot be partitioned into finitely many sum-free sets; this is one of the earliest results in Ramsey theory. A sum-free set S cannot be

universal because if $k \in S$ then no two elements of S can differ by k, and so no finite sequence with ones in positions k apart can occur in S. A sum-free set with characteristic function S is *sf-universal* [**86**] if given any finite zero-one sequence $\sigma = (e_1, \ldots, e_n)$, either (i) $\exists i, j (1 \leq i \leq j \leq n)$ with $e_i = e_j = 1$ and $j - i \in S$, or (ii) σ is a subsequence of S. It can be shown that for any sum-free set S, $\Gamma(S) \cong \mathfrak{H}_3$ if and only if S is sf-universal. Finally the following was proved in [**86**].

6.4. PROPOSITION (P. J. Cameron). *Let $v_0, \ldots, v_n$ be vertices of $\mathfrak{H}_3$, and suppose that the map $e : v_i \to v_{i+1} (i = 0, \ldots, n-1)$ is an isomorphism of induced subgraphs. Then there is a cyclic automorphism of $\mathfrak{H}_k$ extending e.*

We end the section with a result of Macpherson. A Polish group G has a *cyclically dense conjugacy class* if $\exists g, h \in G$ so that $\{g^n h g^{-n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is dense in G. In this case G is topologically 2-generated, that is it has a dense 2-generated subgroup. In [**372**] it is shown that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ has this property.

2. A Construction of $\mathfrak{R}^t$ as a Homogeneous Cayley Object

We use a two-step approach to achieving the stated aim of the section title, using the modular group

$$\beth = \mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z}) = \langle \sigma, \rho : \sigma^2 = \rho^3 = 1 \rangle.$$

We will use the Hebrew character $\beth$ ('gimel') to denote the modular group because we have already reserved the usual symbol Γ for graphs. That $\beth \cong C_2 * C_3$ so that it has so few defining relations, implies that it has many epimorphic images, one of which is $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$. For example $\mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z}) \cong B_3 / \zeta(B_3)$ where the braid group $B_3 = \langle x, y \mid xyx = yxy \rangle$ maps surjectively onto $\mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ via $x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $y \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and the centre of B_3 is generated by $(xy)^3$. The Kurosh subgroup theorem dictates that subgroups of $\beth = C_2 * C_3$ are free products of cyclic groups of orders $2, 3$ or ∞, so ruling out almost all other possible subgroups. The determination of the finite simple quotients of $\mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ is a well-studied area [**486**]. Its above free product presentation implies that such quotients, said to be $(2,3)$-*generated*, are generated by elements x, y such that $x^2 = 1 = y^3$. As in random graph theory, this is often proved probabilistically by demonstrating that almost all groups in a certain class have this property.

First we will show that there is an extension of a certain free product F by a group isomorphic to C_3, the extended group being isomorphic

to $\mathfrak{J}$, and the extending group cyclically permuting three colour classes. Then we show that the group $F = \ker(\mathfrak{J} \to C_3)$ has $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ as a Cayley graph by assigning its inverse pairs of elements randomly to three appropriately chosen classes.

The main result of this section will be that $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is a Cayley object for the group $F \cong C_2 * C_2 * C_2$ in such a way that C_3 permutes the 3 colours cyclically, and $\mathfrak{J} \cong F.C_3$.

The kernel of the homomorphism $\mathfrak{J} \to C_3 = \langle \tau \rangle, \sigma \mapsto 1, \rho \mapsto \tau$, which we have called F, can be obtained [**309**] using Schreier's method, which we now précis.

Consider the group $F_1 = \langle x, y, \ldots \rangle$, with H_1 a fixed subgroup of F_1. A set $\varnothing \neq S \subseteq F_1$ has the Schreier property if $w = x_1 \ldots x_n \in S \Rightarrow x_1 \ldots x_{n-1} \in S$, where $l(w) = n \geq 1$. A Schreier transversal for H_1 in F_1 is a (right) transversal for H_1 with the Schreier property. The algorithm for getting the generators of the kernel is given by the following theorem [**107**, p. 17]:

6.5. Theorem. *Let H be a subgroup of index n in $G = \langle g_1 \ldots g_r \rangle$, with coset representatives $x_1 \ldots x_n$, where $x_1 = 1$ is the representative of H. Let $\bar{g}$ be the representative of the coset Hg. Then*

$$H = \langle x_i g_j (\overline{x_i g_j})^{-1} : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq r \rangle.$$

By inspection, our Schreier transversal is $\{1, \rho, \rho^2\}$. From the above theorem, the generators of F are given by

	σ	ρ
1	$1.\sigma.1^{-1}$	$1.\rho.\rho^{-1}$
ρ	$\rho.\sigma.\rho^{-1}$	$1.\rho^2.\rho^{-2}$
ρ^2	$\rho^2.\sigma.\rho^{-2}$	$1.\rho^3.1^{-1}$

Figure 2. Generators of F

Two of the generators are trivial because we have taken a Schreier transversal and the third is $\rho^3 = 1$. So $F = \langle a, b, c \rangle$, $a = \sigma, b = \rho\sigma\rho^{-1}, c = \rho^2\sigma\rho^{-2}$.

The group F is generated by three involutions. It is known [**304**] that $C_2 * C_2 * C_2$ is the unique index 3 subgroup of $\mathfrak{J}$, so F is the free product $C_2 * C_2 * C_2$. (We mention in passing that $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ has two index 3 subgroups which are conjugate but not identical and so are not normal subgroups [**282**, p. 79]). This can also be shown as follows. Call the quotient H, that is $|\mathfrak{J} : F| = |H| = |\langle\tau\rangle| = 3$, where τ is in the image of the homomorphism $\mathfrak{J} \to C_3 : \rho \mapsto \tau$, with kernel F. Certainly F contains σ and its conjugates $\tau\sigma\tau^{-1}$ and $\tau^{-1}\sigma\tau$. Setting $\rho = \tau\sigma$ gives that $\mathfrak{J}/F$ is cyclic of order 3 generated by τ. Schreier's method can also be used to give the relations satisfied by the generators as well as the generators themselves. Yet another way to find the structure of F is geometric. Recall that $F = C_2 * C_2 * C_2$ is a triangle group with all three triangle vertices at infinity [**368**]. The modular and triangle groups are examples of Fuchsian groups, being discrete subgroups of $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})$. Thus if Δ denotes the hyperbolic triangle with vertices $e^{\pi i/3}, e^{2\pi i/3}, \infty$, then $\tau^{-1}\Delta \cup \Delta \cup \tau\Delta$ represents a fundamental domain [**304**, Lemma V.1.4]. So there are side transformations $\sigma, \tau\sigma\tau^{-1}, \tau^{-1}\sigma\tau, \tau^3$ and one cycle relation: $(\tau^{-1}\sigma\tau)\sigma(\tau\sigma\tau^{-1})\tau^3 = 1$; the latter eliminates the generator τ^3. Since all three transformations are involutions, we conclude that F is the free product of three involutions.

To summarize $H \cong C_3 \lhd \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})/\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) \leq \mathrm{Sym}(3)$. Because $\mathfrak{J}$ has a normal subgroup F and $\langle\tau\rangle \cong C_3$ is a complement for F the extension of F by H splits. There is then an action of $\mathfrak{J}$ on cosets of $\langle\tau\rangle$ with F a regular normal subgroup. We need to construct a copy of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ on this set such that $F \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ and τ cyclically permutes the colour classes.

A mathematical structure such as a graph is a *Cayley Object* [**108**], O, for the group G if its point set are the elements of G and right multiplication by any element of G is an automorphism of O. A Cayley graph for a group F takes the form $\mathrm{Cay}(F,S)$, where S is an inverse-closed subset of $F\backslash\{1\}$ with vertex set F and edge set $\{\{g, sg\} : g \in F, s \in S\}$. As F is countable, we can enumerate the inverse pairs of non-identity elements of F as $\{g_1, g_1^{-1}\}, \{g_2, g_2^{-1}\}, \ldots$. Baire category theory can sometimes be used for building a homogeneous Cayley object for a group G, by showing that almost all G-invariant objects of the required type, that is a residual set of them, are homogeneous. In order to make sense of the notion of a residual set of Cayley graphs for F, specify Cayley graphs by paths in a ternary tree, whereby the three descendents of a node or vertex at level n correspond to including or excluding the inverse pair $\{g_{n+1}, g_{n+1}^{-1}\}$ in one of the colour classes of F; call these colour classes X, Y, Z.



FIGURE 3. Colour classes of F

The set of three-coloured Cayley graphs is identified with the set of paths in the ternary tree; see remark (b) after the next theorem. In Baire category theory if an object is specified by a countable sequence of choices, then the existence of one such object with a given property $\mathcal{P}$ can be proved by showing that $\mathcal{P}$ holds for 'almost all' choices. Let $\mathcal{P}(T)$ denote the set of paths of countable length starting at the root of a tree T, whose nodes at height n are labelled by structures on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. We define the distance between distinct paths p and p' to be $f(n)$, where n is the height of the last node at which p and p' agree, and f is any strictly decreasing function tending to zero. The complete metric space to which the Baire category theorem will be applied arises from paths in rooted trees of countable height. A Cauchy sequence in this space is a sequence of paths agreeing on increasingly longer initial segments, and so has a unique limiting path. In this way we achieve a complete metric space. We require an interpretation of openness and denseness to formulate residual sets in this space. An *open ball* consists of all paths in the tree containing a given vertex. A set S of paths is open (or *finitely determined*) if each path in S has a vertex such that every path through this vertex is in S. A set S is *dense* (or *always reachable*) if it meets every open ball, i.e. if all vertices lie on some path in S. The triality graph is the Fraïssé limit of the class of all appropriately defined finite 3-coloured graphs, so with a countable vertex set the isomorphism class of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is residual in the set of 3-coloured graphs on $\mathbb{N}$. Thus it makes sense to talk of a residual set of Cayley graphs for F. The metric space has an underlying topological space, where the topology is on the collection of inverse closed subsets of F.

The strategy of the construction is as follows: we partition the non-identity inverse pairs of elements of F into 3 classes X, Y, Z such that (a) $g \in X \Rightarrow g^{-1} \in X$ (b) $g \in X \Rightarrow g^{\tau} \in Y, g^{\tau^2}, \in Z$, etc. Give $\{g, h\}$ colour red if $gh^{-1} \in X$, green if $gh^{-1} \in Y$ and blue if $gh^{-1} \in Z$. In other words $x \in X \Rightarrow \rho x \rho^{-1} \in Y, \rho^2 x \rho^{-2} \in Z$, or in terms of elements of F, $word(x, y, z) \in X \Rightarrow word(y, z, x) \in Y \Rightarrow word(z, x, y) \in Z$. Choose

X, Y, Z in such a way as to ensure that the resulting object is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}^t$. Finally we can state our result.

6.6. THEOREM. *Let $F = C_2 * C_2 * C_2$. The set of Cayley graphs for F which are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}^t$ is residual in the set satisfying (a) and (b) above.*

PROOF. Let $\chi(A, B, C)$ be the set of Cayley graphs satisfying the 1-point extension property (equivalently the I-property or homogeneity) of $\mathfrak{R}^t$: for all finite graphs A, B with $A \subseteq B$ and $|B| = |A| + 1$, and any $C \subset F$ with $|C| = |A|$, $(C \cong A) \Rightarrow (\exists z)(C \cup \{z\} \cong B)$. There are countably many such conditions, so by proving that $\chi(A, B, C)$ is open and dense, we demonstrate that our set is a countable intersection of dense open sets, and therefore residual.

We must verify that $\chi(A, B, C)$ is open and dense. That z witnesses $\chi(A, B, C)$ depends only on the colours assigned to xy^{-1} for $x, y \in C \cup \{z\}$, that is a finite number of choices. So $\chi(A, B, C)$ is the finite union of open balls, so is open. To prove $\chi(A, B, C)$ is dense, assume that the first n inverse pairs comprising a finite subset S_0 of S have been chosen, including all xy^{-1} for $x, y \in C$, thereby determining the structure of C. If $C \ncong A$, the argument is finished. Otherwise, we must next choose the above implication. At each step of the $(*_t)$-condition, we have three finite disjoint subsets of vertices $U, V, W \subset F$, with $C = U \cup V \cup W$, and we must find some $z \in F \backslash C$ and extend the colouring so that $zu^{-1} \in X$ for every vertex u in the finite set U, $zv^{-1} \in Y$ for every vertex v in the finite set V, $zw^{-1} \in Z$ for every vertex w in the finite set W. That is we colour the edges zu^{-1} red, the edges zv^{-1} green and the edges zw^{-1} blue. We must eliminate certain elements that could not satisfy the $(*_t)$ condition:

(i) We claim that $\exists z$ such that no $zc^{-1} (c \in C)$ has yet been assigned one of the three colours. For denoting by Φ the finite set whose elements have been assigned colours, then $zc^{-1} \in \Phi \Rightarrow zc^{-1} = \phi \in \Phi \Rightarrow z = \phi c$. Since there are only finitely many ϕ and c, only finitely many z are excluded.

(ii) We must also disqualify any z which would be forced to have the same adjacency to any two of $u \in U, v \in V$ and $w \in W$. These have the form $zu^{-1} = (zv^{-1})^{-1}$ with $u, v \in C$, that is $(zu^{-1})^2 = vu^{-1}$. For a given u and v these have the z in question as translates of non-principal square-root sets [**108**], that is $\{z : (zu^{-1})^2 = vu^{-1}\} = (vu^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}u$. But elements of free products are reduced words in the generators and we want each word to have at most one square root; non-cyclically reduced words are conjugates of reduced words. By conjugation if necessary,

we can assume that the word does not begin and end with the same letter. Note that conjugation does not change the number of square roots. It then follows that each word has at most one square root, for if $word(u,v,w) = word'(u,v,w)\ word'(u,v,w)$ then $(word(u,v,w))^{\frac{1}{2}} = word'(u,v,w)$. Any cancellation here would require the last letter of the first $word'$ to be the same as the first letter of the second $word'$, contrary to assumption. Again only finitely many such z are excluded.

(iii) Next consider z for which $(zu^{-1})^\tau = zv^{-1}$, and $u, v \in C$. Suppose that z begins with a certain letter a. If not all of z cancels into u^{-1} or v^{-1} then zu^{-1} will also begin with a, as will zv^{-1}. However under the action of τ, $(zu^{-1})^\tau$ will be a word whose first letter is b, contradiction. So in order to avoid getting $(zu^{-1})^\tau = zv^{-1}$, we simply choose all our z's to have reduced length greater than any element so far put into C; so only finitely many such z are excluded.

(iv) Finally we must show that given a finite set C, there is z such that $(zu^{-1})^\tau \neq (zv^{-1})^{-1}$ for $u, v \in C$. So we ask when does $(zu^{-1})^\tau = vz^{-1}$, i.e. $z^\tau = vz^{-1}u^\tau$? Take z to be a repeated series of letters abc, such that it is at least twice as long as any element of C. So $z = \ldots abcabcabc \ldots$ and $z^{-1} = \ldots cbacbacba \ldots$. Then clearly, with $z = (abc)^n$ and n sufficiently large, the required inequality holds. There are infinitely many z.

So for any three finite disjoint sets U, V and $W \subset F$, there exists $z \in F \backslash C$ such that, for all $u \in U, v \in V, w \in W$, we have $(zu^{-1})^\tau \neq (zv^{-1})^{-1}$, $(zu^{-1})^{\tau^2} \neq (zv^{-1})^{-\tau}$, and $(zu^{-1}) \neq (zv^{-1})^{-\tau^2}$ and also $zu^{-1}, zv^{-1}, zw^{-1}$ have not yet been assigned to X, Y, Z. Now assign all zu^{-1} to X, all zv^{-1} to Y and all zw^{-1} to Z; then the induced subgraph on $C \cup \{z\}$ is isomorphic to B, no matter what further choices we make.

Our argument that $(zu^{-1})^\tau \neq (zv^{-1})^{-1}$ provides another reason why any group larger than C_3 acting on the colours would cause the construction to fail, for even an extra C_2 involution invalidates the argument in (iv).

In total, we have excluded only finitely many z, so infinitely many choices remain for us to satisfy the 1-point extension hypothesis of the theorem. We have proved that the set $\chi(A,B,C)$ of Cayley graphs is dense. The Baire category theorem implies that the intersection of all the sets $\chi(A,B,C)$ is residual and hence non-empty. It follows that $\mathfrak{J}$ acts on the vertices of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ with F as a regular subgroup because it is transitive, and the stabilizer of a vertex is the identity. Hence result. □

It follows that $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{Z}) < \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$.

It is open whether or not $\mathrm{PGL}(2,\mathbb{Z}) < \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$, where the *extended modular group* $\mathrm{PGL}(2,\mathbb{Z}) := \mathrm{GL}(2,\mathbb{Z})/\{\pm I\}$ and $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ is a subgroup of index 2 in $\mathrm{PGL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ [**313**].

The group $C_2 * C_2 * C_2$ has been sufficiently important in exhibiting the structure of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ as a Cayley graph that in the interest of potential future extensions of this section we make some tangential remarks.

Remarks

(a) Exhibiting a multicoloured random graph as the Cayley graph of any countable group requires the satisfaction of the square root condition, pairwise over all the colours. This condition is derived in [**103**], but see also Theorem 6.22 later on in this chapter.

(b) The *modular group of first level* given by $\beth = \beth(1) = \mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{Z}) = \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})/\{\pm I\}$, where $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z}) := \{\frac{az+b}{cz+d} \mid a,b,c,d \in \mathbb{Z}, ad - bc = 1\}$ has subgroups arising as follows. The *modular group of level n*, also called the *principal modular subgroup of level n*, $\beth(n) \lhd \beth(1)$ is defined by the requirement that $[ab/cd]$ be congruent to the identity $[10/01] \pmod n$. If $\beth(1)$ is generated by the substitutions $A : z \to z+1$ and $B : z \to -1/z$, then $\beth(2)$ is the free group on $A^2 = [12/01]$ and $BA^{-2}B = [10/21]$. It can be shown [**389**] that $\beth(1)/\beth(2) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(3)$. Therefore we see that an index 6 subgroup of $\beth$ exists, but for Theorem 6.6 to work we require the action of $C_2 * C_2 * C_2$ rather than $\beth(2)$.

(c) J. H. Conway found a way of determining whether or not the plane can be tesselated by given tiles. A relation in a group is a word in the generators which represents the identity element 1. A relation in an infinite finitely presented group is a tile and a planar region can be tiled only if the group element describing the boundary of the region is 1. The Cayley graph $\Gamma(G)$ of a group G extends to a 2-complex $[\Gamma(G)]^2$ where at each relevant vertex we attach as many discs as there are relations r_i, so that the disc boundary traces out the words r_i. In [**520**] Thurston shows how an element $g(\pi) \in F = C_2 * C_2 * C_2$ is determined by a path π in the 1-skeleton of a hexagonal grid.

(d) A. W. M. Dress defined [**184**] a *(thin) chamber system* (of rank 2) to be just a set C on which the above free Coxeter group $F = \langle u, v, w | u^2 = v^2 = w^2 = 1 \rangle$ acts from the right. An isomorphism between two chamber systems C and C' is a bijection $f : \mathsf{C} \to \mathsf{C}'$ such that $f(\mathsf{C}g) = f(\mathsf{C})g$ for all $C \in \mathsf{C}$ and $g \in F$. The relation between tilings and chamber systems is established and it is proved that there is a 1–1 correspondence

between isomorphism classes of non-degenerate tilings of the Euclidean plane and isomorphism classes of infinite chamber systems satisfying given conditions. A metric can be defined on C by $d(C,C') := \inf(l(g)|g \in F,\ Cg = C')\ \forall\ C,C' \in \mathsf{C}$, and $d(C,C') = \infty$ if and only if C,C' lie in different F-orbits.

Recall that to specify a transitive action of $\mathfrak{Z}$ on a finite vertex set V with pointwise stabilizer $\mathfrak{Z}_0$ of one distinguished vertex v_0 is equivalent to specifying a finite index subgroup $\mathfrak{Z}_0$ of $\mathfrak{Z}$, where the vertices of V can be identified with the cosets of $\mathfrak{Z}_0\backslash\mathfrak{Z}$, and v_0 with the coset $\mathfrak{Z}_0$. There is another work [**387**] which studies the regular action of the whole modular group as opposed to the index 3 subgroup in our previous theorem. A coset multigraph consisting of triangles and single edges is given for a permutation representation of $\mathfrak{Z} = \mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ on the cosets of a point stabilizer $\mathfrak{Z}^\mu$, for every torsion-free genus zero congruence subgroup $\mathfrak{Z}^\mu$ of index μ in $\mathfrak{Z}$. The Cayley graph of $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{Z}) = \langle \sigma,\rho : \sigma^2 = 1 = \rho^3 \rangle$ is the infinite free trivalent tree with each node replaced by a positively oriented triangle corresponding to ρ. Collapsing the triangles to points gives the set of vertices of our above constructed Cayley graph. In a sense this is a special case of the known result that if $H \leq G$, $g \in G, g^2 = 1$ and $|H : H \cap H^g| = m$ then G acts vertex and edge-transitively on an m-valent graph. (More is known from applications of group amalgams to algebraic graph theory [**303**, p. 417]. Let x and $\{x,y\}$ be a vertex and an edge of the graph Γ with respective stabilizers H and K in $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$. If G is vertex-transitive then $\{x,y\}$ is invertible so $|K : H \cap K| = 2$. If Γ is trivalent then $|H : H \cap K| = 3$. If Γ is connected it follows that $G = \langle H, K \rangle$. The G-action on Γ is faithful, so H and K have no common nontrivial normal subgroups).

Recall that the *principal congruence subgroup* of level $n \geq 0$ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ defined by, $\mathfrak{Z}(n) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{Z} \mid a \equiv 1, b \equiv 0, c \equiv 0, d \equiv 1 \pmod{n} \right\}$.

A *congruence subgroup* is a subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ containing $\mathfrak{Z}(n)$ for some n, for example, $\mathfrak{Z}_0(n) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{Z} \mid c \equiv 0 \pmod{n} \right\}, n \in \mathbb{N}$. By definition the sequence

$$1 \to \mathfrak{Z}(n) \to \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$$

is exact.

3. Lattice Constructions of Random Graphs

A lattice $\mathbb{L}$ in a real finite-dimensional vector space V is a subgroup of V satisfying one of the following equivalent conditions:

(i) $\mathbb{L}$ is discrete and $V/\mathbb{L}$ is compact;

(ii) $\mathbb{L}$ is discrete and generates the $\mathbb{R}$-vector space V;

(iii) V has an $\mathbb{R}$-basis $(e_1, \ldots, e_n)$ which is a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\mathbb{L}$ (that is $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{Z}e_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{Z}e_n$).

So a lattice in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the set of integral linear combinations of n linearly independent vectors. The lattices generated by vectors of norm 1 are $\mathbb{Z}^n$ with the standard bilinear form. (This norm is the squared norm as we shall be dealing with positive-definite lattices). Those generated by vectors of norm 2, which are called *roots*, are the root lattices have a classification theorem, whilst those of norm 3 do not as yet. Even unimodular lattices, those having one point per unit volume and in which every squared length is even, exist only when the dimension is a multiple of 8, and the unique 8-dimensional one is denoted E_8 because it is the root lattice of the corresponding Lie algebra. In any even positive-definite lattice, the *roots* are those vectors with minimal non-zero norm of 2; they are special because whereas reflecting through vectors will not in general map the lattice to itself, reflecting through roots is a lattice automorphism. Those lattices that are spanned by their roots are precisely the orthogonal direct sums of the so-called ADE lattices, that is *Dynkin diagrams*. There is here a direct link between lattices and graphs. For example, if $V = \mathbb{L} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ is a real vector space, $\{\alpha\} \in \mathbb{L}$ the set of roots of $\mathbb{L}$, Δ the set of roots corresponding to the walls of a particular chamber (connected component of V), then we can build a graph $\Gamma_{\mathbb{L}}$ whose vertices are the elements of Δ and edges between those vertices α, β for which $(\alpha, \beta) = -1$.

We will prove a general theorem connecting random graphs of any number of colours and integral lattices. Our main aim however is to find links to the primary even unimodular lattices and with this in mind we prove a 1–1 correspondence between $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ and the Leech lattice which is the only even unimodular lattice in 24 dimensions with no vectors of squared length 2. This is one of the 24 even unimodular lattices in 24 dimensions classified by Niemeier; it represents the densest packings in 24 dimensions. We shall refer to a spherical layer of vectors in the lattice that are all the same distance from the origin as a *shell*.

Now for the constructions, firstly working with a general colour set of size m.

A Cayley graph for the lattice $\mathbb{L}$, here regarded as a subgroup of a finite-dimensional vector space, takes the form $\mathrm{Cay}(\mathbb{L}, S)$, where the vertices are $l \in \mathbb{L}$ and the inverse-closed subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{L}\backslash\{1\}$ gives the edge set $\{\{l, l+s\} : l \in \mathbb{L}, s \in S\}$ written additively.

We not only want to produce a Cayley graph for the lattice, but more specifically one satisfying the extra condition that it is invariant under the automorphism group of the lattice, for then the lattice isometries will be Cayley graph automorphisms. That is, denoting the additive group of the lattice by $\mathbb{L}^+$, we are embedding $\mathbb{L}^+ \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$ into $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ as a permutation group. The automorphism groups of the random graphs for any number of colours are uncountable.

Partition the elements of $\mathbb{L}$ into m disjoint classes $U_1, \ldots, U_m$ corresponding to colours $c_1, \ldots, c_m$. One way to do this which yields the extra condition is to partition $\mathbb{N}$ into m disjoint classes $U_1, \ldots, U_m$, and letting $\tilde{U}_i$ be the set of lattice vectors v with $\parallel v \parallel \in U_i$ give $\{x, y\}$ colour c_i if $y - x \in \tilde{U}_i$. We describe this procedure as "assigning shells in $\mathbb{L}$ to m boxes."

We must choose our $\{U_i\}$ so as to ensure that in the sense of Baire category, almost all colourings result in an object isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$.

6.7. Theorem. *Let $\mathbb{L}$ be a lattice in $\mathbb{R}^d$, for $d \geq 2$ and take an integer $m \geq 2$. Assigning the shells in $\mathbb{L}$ to m boxes, the set of Cayley graphs for $\mathbb{L}$ with lattice vectors as vertices and vector pairs as edges, which are isomorphic to the random m-coloured graph is residual.*

Proof. The topological space in which the Baire category argument takes place is the space of assignments of shells to boxes. Construct a tree whose vertices at level n are assignments of the first n shells to boxes; the descendents of the vertices of level n are obtained by assigning the $(n+1)^{st}$ shell to a box. Paths in this tree now correspond to assignments of all shells to boxes. Our approach is to partition the distances between the lattice vectors into m colour (equivalence) classes. We throw vectors, one shell at a time, into a coloured box. For all finite graphs A, B and C, let $\chi(A, B, C)$ be the set of Cayley graphs satisfying the 1-point extension property for countable m-coloured random graphs $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$: for all finite graphs A, B with $A \subseteq B$ and $|B| = |A|+1$, and any $C \subset \mathbb{L}$ with $|C| = |A|$, $(C \cong A) \Rightarrow (\exists z)(C \cup \{z\} \cong B)$.

The set $\chi(A, B, C)$ is open because only those finite number of vertices in C whose distances fall within one of the m colour classes must be witnessed by any chosen z, so the set of distances is finitely determined. To prove that $\chi(A, B, C)$ is dense assume that the first n vertex pairs comprising a finite subset of S have been chosen and that all edges between vertex pairs of C have been coloured. If $C \not\cong A$ we

are done, otherwise we must demonstrate that the 1-point extension property holds. Choose m finite disjoint subsets of vertices $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^m \subset \mathbb{L}$, with $C \supseteq \bigcup_i U_i$ and $z \in \mathbb{L}\backslash C$ such that $d(z,u_i) = c_i, \forall u_i \in U_i$. Without loss of generality assume $C = \bigcup_i U_i$. Defining $H_U = \{z : d(z,u_i) = d(z,u_j),\ 1 \le i \ne j \le m,\ u_i \in U_i\}$, we observe that H_U is a finite union of hyperplanes.

Given that the lattice $\mathbb{L}$ is infinite in d independent directions and that C is finite, any $z \in \mathbb{L}\backslash C$ with $||z||$ sufficiently large will have a distance from any element of C that has not yet been assigned to a colour class. We must also disqualify any z which has the same adjacency to, i.e. is equidistant from any two of $u_i \in U_i, u_j \in U_j, 1 \le i \ne j \le m$; in other words those lying on a hyperplane. This is equivalent to showing that we cannot cover a lattice $\mathbb{L}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ by finitely many affine hyperplanes and a finite set (of vertices chosen up to that point). Let $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_r$ be a finite collection of hyperplanes and S a finite set of lattice points of size $|S| = s$. Choose a large prime p and look at $\mathbb{L}/p\mathbb{L}$. Now $|\mathbb{L}/p\mathbb{L}| = p^n$ for some integer $1 \le n \le d$ (compare $\mathbb{L}$ to $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{L}/p\mathbb{L}$ to $\mathbb{Z}_p^n$). But the image under the reduction map of each hyperplane has size p^{n-1} as the hyperplane has codimension 1 in the space, so the image of the hyperplanes and S contain $\le r \cdot p^{n-1} + s$ points. As long as $p^n > r \cdot p^{n-1} + s$ we are done. This is true for p sufficiently large and so the result follows by Euclid's theorem that there exists an infinity of primes. □

It is immediate that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L}) \le \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, since automorphisms of $\mathbb{L}$ are isometries.

6.8. Corollary. *The free abelian groups $\mathbb{Z}^d$ act on random graphs $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ for integers $d, m \ge 2$, so as to preserve colours.*

Proof. $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is an integer lattice in $\mathbb{R}^d$. □

A d–dimensional *crystallographic (or Bieberbach) group* is a cocompact discrete group of isometries of d–dimensional Euclidean space.

6.9. Corollary. *The Bieberbach groups are subgroups of* $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$.

Proof. This is immediate from the structure of Bieberbach groups as free abelian by finite. □

For the next theorem, we require the complexified version of the Leech lattice $\mathbb{L}_L$ [**157**, p.293].

For every vector $x \in \mathbb{L}_L$, defining a vector in $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ by $x(a + b\omega) = ax + b(x\omega)$, where ω is a primitive cube root of 1, gives a 12-dimensional

lattice (or module) over the Eisenstein integers $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ (see Appendix 16) whose automorphism group is the central extension $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}) = 6 \cdot \mathrm{Suz}$, where Suz denotes the Suzuki group. Vectors x_i, y_i, z_i $(i \in PL(11))$ have a definition that includes triplet formation $x_i + y_i + z_i = 0$ with Conway group element $\omega \in \mathrm{Co}_0$ having the transitive action $\omega : x_i \to y_i \to z_i \to x_i$. Vectors in $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ can be written in terms of the ternary Golay code. Also $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ is the union of a lattice and two translates. The underlying real lattice $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{R}}$ of $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ is scaled to have minimal norm 6. More on the sporadic simple groups of Suzuki and Conway can be found in [**155**].

6.10. THEOREM. *There is a* 1–1 *correspondence between vectors in* $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ *and vertices in* $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$*, and* $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ *is a Cayley object for* $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ *such that multiplication by* ω *permutes the* 3 *colours cyclically.*

PROOF. The first part of the statement follows from a similar type of argument to that of Theorem 6.6, given that $\mathbb{L}_L$ and $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ are different descriptions of the same object. The topological space in which the Baire category argument takes place is the space of inverse pairs of vectors in $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$, with a partitioning of the vector pairs into 3 colour classes. The argument must satisfy the action of ω which imitates the C_3 action on the colours that arises in Theorem 6.6, so it remains to verify this. Notice that the Eisenstein integers are simply an index, so the ω-action is effectively $(a + b\omega)x\ (= x_i) \to (a\omega + b\omega^2)x\ (= y_i) \to (a\omega^2 + b)x\ (= z_i) \to (a + b\omega)x\ (= x_i)$ that is $(a, b) \to (-b, a - b) \to (b - a, -a) \to (a, b)$. Assign vectors in $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ randomly to the three 'colour' classes x_i, y_i, z_i. To show that this gives $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, we must show that we can still satisfy the 1-point extension property once we have thrown away the errant vectors that are equidistant from two differently coloured vectors. That is we want vectors $z_i = (p + q\omega)z$ such that no two of $d\big((p, q) - (a, b)\big)$, $d\big((p, q) - (-b, a - b)\big)$ and $d\big((p, q) - (b - a, -a)\big)$ are equal, for Euclidean metric distance function d. Taken pairwise, these conditions give us at worst three quadratic equations (in p and q) defining three quadratic curves lying in three planes, to be avoided. By the same type of argument employed in Theorem 6.7 we can evade any finite number of such planes and still retain a countable infinity of such vertices z_i to build $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. So $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is a Cayley object for $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$. If a vector v is given a certain colour then $-v$ acquires the same colour. Also since ω is an isometry, $v, \omega v$ and $\omega^2 v$ are isometric so once a colour is chosen for v, ωv and $\omega^2 v$ get assigned colours unambiguously according to the 3-cycle of the colours. Hence result. □

Remarks

1. Note that x and $-x$ have the same colour, as do y and $-y$, and z and $-z$, so we actually have two mutually dependent 3-cycles.

2. The fixed-point-free action of ω ensures that there is never ambiguity in assigning vectors a colour.

3. This last theorem, together with Theorem 6.6 demonstrate that a Cayley object is not associated with a unique group or structure. We already have a much better example of this: $\mathfrak{R}$ is a Cayley graph for any countable group satisfying the square-root condition (see Appendix 1 and [**103**]), and in particular, any abelian group A in which the subgroup $\{a : 2a = 0\}$ has infinite index.

4. From Euclidean geometry it is well-known that the union of a finite number of hyperplanes in a real vector space does not exhaust the space. This is used, for example, in proving that a root system for a Lie algebra has a base [**299**, p. 48].

5. Theorem 6.10 uses little other than the existence of a fixed-point free automorphism of order 3. The result for a more general lattice is given below in Theorem 6.14.

That $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L}_L) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ follows from Theorem 6.7. Furthermore $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) \rtimes C_3$, the group on the right-hand side being the reduct of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ that permutes the 3 colours cyclically. In fact we have that for the Conway groups,

$$\mathrm{Co}_0 < \mathrm{Co}_\infty < \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}),$$

where $\mathrm{Co}_\infty := \mathbb{L}_L \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L}_L)$ is the affine automorphism group of $\mathbb{L}_L$ arrived at when $\mathbb{L}_L$ acts on itself by translations.

4. Difficulties in Directly Proving Cartan Triality of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$

In this section we find more links between graphs, groups and lattices. We shall conclude that any hope of finding a direct link using the Cayley object method, between the two occurrences of triality, the normalizing action of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ on $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ and that of Cartan is likely to fail, because of the absence of a fixed-point-free group action which we would require to achieve sufficient randomness to build $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$.

In the preface we conjectured that there exists a connection between the colour triality of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ as given by the outer automorphic action of $T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ on $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ and a generalization of the algebraic triality outer automorphisms of the 8-dimensional projective reduced orthogonal group. Demonstrating such a connection would involve showing that the $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ group action normalizing $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ can be traced back to, or in fact be induced by a generalization of

the Cartan triality Sym(3) action on the vector and two spinor representations of Spin(8). In this section we will indicate why there are difficulties in proving a direct connection.

6.11. LEMMA. *If $\mathbb{L}$ is a d-dimensional lattice for $d \geq 2$, the proportion of regular orbits to the total number of orbits of* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$ *acting on $\mathbb{L}$ tends to* 1*, as the lengths of vectors approach infinity.*

PROOF. (Proof from first principles). The number of lattice vertices at distance at most n from the origin is $O(n^d)$. For any $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$, at most $O(n^{d-1})$ points are fixed by g, since $xg = x$ is a set of linear equations with non-zero rank. The number of automorphisms is finite, so as $n \to \infty$, the proportion of regular orbits to the total number of orbits approaches 1. □

In other words almost all vectors lie in regular orbits of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$.

PROOF. (Second proof) The theta-function

$$\Theta(\mathbb{L}) = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{L}} x^{|v|^2},$$

is the generating function for lattice vectors by length. Now, for any automorphism $g \in G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$ of $\mathbb{L}$, the fixed points of g form a sublattice $\mathbb{L}^g$, with theta-function $\Theta(\mathbb{L}^g)$. By summing these and dividing by $|G|$, we get the generating function for the number of orbits; call it $\Lambda(\mathbb{L}, G)$. Similarly one can compute $\Lambda(\mathbb{L}, H)$ for any subgroup H of G. Now a Möbius inversion over the lattice of subgroups of G gives a generating function for regular orbits.

If $\Theta(\mathbb{L}) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} a_r x^r$ where $a_r = |\{v \in \Gamma | v.v = 2r\}|$ then a_r counts the lattice vertices lying on a sphere of radius $\sqrt{2r}$ around the origin. So a_r grows like the area of the sphere, that is $(\sqrt{2r})^{d-1}$. But $\lim_{r\to\infty} \sqrt[r]{(\sqrt{2r})^{d-1}} = 1$ [**192**] and so $\lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{\sqrt[r]{(\sqrt{2r})^{d-1}}}{\sqrt[r]{(\sqrt{2r})^{d-2}}} = 1$.

□

This result for vectors in lattices mirrors the one for regular orbits of permutation groups on the power set [**85**].

We next work towards identifying different trialities associated with $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, making use of the $\mathbb{ATLAS}$ [**155**] in the initial discussion. We denote the cube root of unity by ω and consider the elements g of order 3 in the Conway group $\mathrm{Co}_0 = 2{\cdot}\,\mathrm{Co}_1$, a non-split extension.

Let g be an element of order 3, and let $f = \mathrm{fix}(g)$ be the number of its fixed points. Then the 24–dimensional matrix representation of g has the following breakdown of eigenvalues: ♯ eigenvalues of value $1 = f$,

$\sharp$ eigenvalues of value $\omega = 12 - f/2$, $\sharp$ eigenvalues of value $\omega^2 = 12 - f/2$. So the character $\chi(g)$ of g is $\chi(g) = f - (12 - f/2) = 3f/2 - 12$.

	3A	3B	3C	3D
$\chi(g)$	-12	6	-3	0
f	0	12	6	8

FIGURE 4. Permutation characters and fixed points in conjugacy classes of Co_1 3-cycles

The character in Table 4 is χ_{102} [**155**, pp.183, 186]. By inspection of the table, the 3A fixed-point-free element is the central element $\omega \in 6 \cdot \mathrm{Suz}$ (see the prelude to Theorem 6.10). We are justified in keeping the same notation for the corresponding element of Co_1 because from [**155**, pp.131] we know that the unit scalars which can be regarded as a fixed-point-free subgroup $2A_3$ of $2\,\mathrm{Co}_1$ can be extended to fixed-point-free groups $2A_4$ and $2A_5$ which yield the quaternionic and icosian Leech lattices. The quaternions $\pm 1, \pm i, \pm j, \pm k, \frac{-1+i+j+k}{2}$ multiplicatively generate $2A_4$ [**155**, pp.97]. J. Tits [**523**] has given an account of how centralizers in Co_0 of double coverings of alternating groups form an important series of groups.

The 3D element τ fixes each $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ and permutes the three $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ cyclically, which given that $\chi(g) = 0$ therefore has the matrix form $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & * \\ * & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, with each entry being 8–dimensional. If we identify the icosian ring with $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$, then each vector in the Leech lattice over the icosians can be written as an element of $\oplus_i \mathbb{L}_{E_8}^{(i)}$. The double cover of the Hall-Janko group $2{\cdot}J_2$ can be realized as the automorphism group of the Leech lattice over the icosians, and contains an element that permutes these three $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ [**556**]. Griess has shown [**254**, p.83] that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L}_L)$ acts transitively on the set of sublattices isometric to $\sqrt{2}\,\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$.

The $3B$ element also has an interpretation. The $3B$ element fixes half of the 24 dimensions, so in an icosian description of $\mathbb{L}_L$ where the 3 imaginary units of the quaternion algebra are e_1, e_2, e_3, this fixes the real unit 1 and the combination $e_1 + e_2 + e_3$. So $3B$ acts as the 3-cycle of the 3 constituent $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$s inside the icosian Leech lattice (see the paper by Wilson [**556**]). According to [**333**] this 3-cycle of the simple roots e_1, e_2, e_3, which is an element of the binary tetrahedral automorphism group of the SO(8) root lattice, is also the outer automorphic 3-cycle of this lattice.

Notwithstanding the general result Theorem 6.7 connecting coloured random graphs and lattices, we would like to explore a little further what happens in the specific case of the exceptional lattices, $\mathbb{L}_L$ and $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$. First we state a theorem that connects these two lattices.

6.12. Theorem (Lepowski and Meurman). *If we renormalize the 2-dimensional lattice so that $\mathbb{L}_L/\sqrt{2}$ is even unimodular without vectors of length 2, then* [**354**]

$$2(\mathbb{L}_{E_8} \oplus \mathbb{L}_{E_8} \oplus \mathbb{L}_{E_8}) \subset \mathbb{L}_L \subset (\mathbb{L}_{E_8})^3.$$

In the next proposition, the element ω acts as an automorphism by scalar multiplication by $e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}$ on the complex Leech lattice $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$, permutes the three $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ lattices and lies in the centre of the group Co_1. Acting with ω turns the 24-dimensional vector space $E_8^3/(2E_8)^3$ over $\mathbb{F}_2$ into a vector space over $\mathbb{F}_4 = \mathbb{F}_2(\omega)$. The vector space $\mathbb{L}_L/(2E_8)^3$ is then 12-dimensional. The existence of a fixed-point free automorphism of order 3 was also used in Theorem 6.10. The other 3-cycle to consider is τ, an automorphism of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. The fixed points of τ lie in 3-cycles of ω, so the colouring of ω-cycles is fixed by τ, and we need to show that the total action has the form $C_3 \times C_3$. The most natural way to show that τ commutes with ω is to demonstrate that ω preserves $\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}}$ (or just that it preserves the complex structure on $\mathbb{R}^{24} \geq 2\mathbb{L}_{E_8} \oplus 2\mathbb{L}_{E_8} \oplus 2\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$). This latter property follows since as we noted above the ω operation takes $x_i \to y_i \to z_i \to x_i$ for each $i \in PL(11)$. The τ-action is $\tau : (E_8)_1 \to (E_8)_2 \to (E_8)_3 \to (E_8)_1 : a \mapsto a\tau \mapsto a\tau^2 \mapsto a$, where a triple $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \to (a_3\tau, a_1\tau, a_2\tau)$. If a vector is fixed by τ then so is its image under ω, so the vectors $v, v\omega, v\omega^2$ are coloured the same.

We will see that we can choose a colouring from $\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}$ of the 3-cycles of both τ and ω.

6.13. Proposition.
(i) The colouring of the vectors has a $C_3 \times C_3$ symmetry, this being the 3-cycle of $\mathbb{L}_L$–vectors in Co_1 generated by the order 3 element ω and the 3-cycle τ on the edge colours of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ that is a coset of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$.
(ii) $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is a Cayley graph for $2(\mathbb{L}_{E_8} \oplus \mathbb{L}_{E_8} \oplus \mathbb{L}_{E_8})$ as a sublattice of $\mathbb{L}_L$.

Proof. (i) The topological space in which a Baire category argument can be fashioned is the space of assignments of 3-cycle orbits into 3 colour classes. We can ignore the factor of 2 outside the direct sum in the previous lemma because our colouring is of orbits of lattice vectors rather than their lengths; the origin of this factor is given in the statement of Theorem 6.12.

A typical vector is of the form (a_1, a_2, a_3), where $a_j \in \mathbb{L}_{E_8}^{(j)}$. Vectors are coloured as $(a, a\tau, a\tau^2)$-triples, and fixed points are of the form

$a \oplus a\tau \oplus a\tau^2$. Assign vectors of the form $(a,0,0)$ (respectively $(0,b,0)$, $(0,0,c)$) the colour $\mathfrak{r}$ (respectively $\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g}$). Any vector (a,b,c) not of this form and not fixed by τ can be randomly assigned a colour whilst its images under τ can be coloured according to a 3-cycle of colours. This applies to the fixed points of τ which lie in 3-cycles of ω.

The finite set S of points that are coloured is a union of orbits of $\langle G(2,2),\tau,-1\rangle$, where the last element arises because we want to colour a vector and its negative the same. Here the group $G(2,2)$ is the automorphism group of the octonions or, equivalently, the subgroup of $\mathrm{SO}(7)$ that stabilizes a singular vector in its 8-dimensional real spinor representation. The fixed points of τ in the commutator subgroup $\Omega^+(8,2)$ of $O^+(8,2)$ form the group $G(2,2)$.

(ii) The vectors in $\oplus_i \mathbb{L}_{E_8}^{(i)}$ $(i=1,2,3)$ are randomly coloured either according to 3-cycles of τ on the three $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ lattices (if the vectors do not belong to $\mathrm{fix}(\tau)$), or from the discussion in the preamble to this proposition, according to 3-cycles of ω (if they do belong to $\mathrm{fix}(\tau)$). The two sets of vectors involved are disjoint and as we noted the two types of colouring are done independently. The result goes through as a special case of the analysis of the next theorem. □

The argument for a more general lattice is the following,

6.14. Theorem. *Let $\mathbb{L}$ be a d-dimensional lattice for $d \geq 2$, and let $\langle\tau\rangle \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$, where τ is of order 3 fixing only the origin 0. Assume that τ fixes no vector (see the special case in the previous proposition). Then each $\langle\tau\rangle$-orbit is made up of three vectors permuted by τ. If we choose one point in each orbit, with the further requirement that if v is chosen then so is $-v$ (the colour of a lattice vector and its negative must be the same), colour chosen points randomly, so that* $\mathrm{col}(\{u,v\}) = \mathrm{col}(u-v)$ *where the left-hand colour is that of an edge and the right-hand colour is that of a lattice vector, and extend to a colouring of the other two vectors cyclically by $\mathfrak{r}\to\mathfrak{b}\to\mathfrak{g}\to\mathfrak{r}$, then with probability 1 we obtain a coloured Cayley graph for the additive group of the lattice that is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. Furthermore, this can be extended to the action of both τ and ω (which is as above).*

Proof. Suppose that a finite set $S = U \cup V \cup W$ of vectors is given. To satisfy the one-point extension property $(*_t)$ required to identify $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ we require a vertex z such that

(i) $z \notin S$,

(ii) $z - x \notin S$ for $x \in S$,

(iii) $(z-x_1)g \neq z - x_2$ for $x_1, x_2 \in S$, $g \in \langle -I, \tau\rangle$.

Both (i) and (ii) exclude finitely many vectors. If $(z-x_1)g = z-x_2$ we require that $g \neq 1$ as $x_1 \neq x_2$. Then $zg-z = x_1g-x_2$, where the elements on the right-hand side are only finite in number. So as $z(g-1) = a$, say, z lies in a coset of $\ker(g-1)$, which given that $g \neq 1$ is a proper subspace. So we have to exclude the finite union of finitely many proper subspaces. So there are still infinitely many z left to satisfy $(*_t)$. For any further point z the colours of $z-x$ are independent for $x \in X$.

If $s = |S| = |U| \cup |V| \cup |W|$, then the probability that z is not correctly joined is $1 - \frac{1}{3^s}$. Choosing $z_1, \ldots, z_i$ the probability $p(z_1, \ldots, z_i)$ that these vertices are not correctly joined is

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3^s}\right)^i = 0.$$

Consider triples of orbits. Colour the points in one orbit randomly and colour all their τ-images and τ^2-images with the other two colours. Let $g_l \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L})$ and let the corresponding image under subgroup inclusion $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L}) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ be $g_r \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$. Then it follows that $g_r \in C_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})}(\tau)$. It is clear that $\tau \in \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ is inducing the 3-cycle on the colours.

We can extend this to the situation with $g \in \langle -I, \tau, \omega \rangle$ by a similar argument. □

By Theorem 6.7 almost all the lattice vector pair colourings can be put into 1–1 correspondence with $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ edge colourings. According to [**333**] the 3-cycle on the three $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ lattices is precisely the Cartan triality 3-cycle which we denote τ_C . Result (ii) of Proposition 6.13 means that the Cayley graph construction of Theorem 6.14 does not suffice for us to claim that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ derives at least its 3-cycle outer automorphism from the exceptional 8–dimensional Cartan triality of E_8 representations. The presence of the fixed points of the τ orbit restricts the otherwise free choice of colourings and thus precludes full randomness; this forbids us from making a 1–1 correspondence of the 3-cycles. The fixed points of τ are not an artifact of the particular colouring scheme that we employed but rather of the overall method in conjunction with the use of 8-dimensional spaces, for they would still be present had we assigned the orbits of pairs of lattice vectors of the Cayley right regular action of $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ on itself, as we show next.

If we were colouring regular orbits rather than 3-cycles then *every* regular orbit has a subset of size $|G(2,2)| = 12096$ [**158**, p.125] [**155**, p.14] of coloured vectors representing lattice points fixed by τ, in other words group elements commuting with the cycle action. Let $G_1 = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L}_{E_8})/\{\pm 1\} \cong SO^+(8, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$. Notice that we can identify a vector

$v \in \mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ with its translate $t_v \in \mathbb{L}^+_{E_8}$, where $\mathbb{L}^+_{E_8} = \{(x \mapsto x+v) : x, v \in \mathbb{L}_{E_8}\}$ is the additive group of the lattice; $\mathbb{L}^+_{E_8}$ is a permutation of $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$. Identify the elements in the regular orbits of G_1 with elements of G_1, so that an infinite number of copies of the finite group G_1 are being considered. Because the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L}_{E_8})$ acts as an additive general linear group of the lattice, its elements act like lattice isometries. But by definition of a linear map, stabilizing lengths requires stabilization of the origin, and this is conjugate to stabilizing another point of the lattice, call it z.

Let S be a finite set of points in the lattice $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$. We want to find a point z such that

(i) all points of S lie in different regular orbits of the pointwise stabilizer G_z of z which is conjugate to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L}_{E_8})$, and

(ii) the length of z is arbitrarily large.

Property (i) is required to ensure that every lattice point can be coloured unambiguously.

The point $c \in S$ is in a regular orbit of G_z if and only if the point z is in a regular orbit of G_c. For each $c \in S$ and for each $g \in G_c, g \neq 1$, the set of fixed points of g is contained in an affine subspace. We must choose z from outside all such subspaces and so outside of their union. This is always possible because the affine subspace in question is a lattice translation of a finite proper sublattice, so that the union of the translated points is a translation of a finite set. Therefore the colouring of $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ can be extended to a colouring of all the pairs of vectors in $\oplus_i \mathbb{L}^{(i)}_{E_8}$ in a way that is invariant under translations.

Property (ii) is easily achieved by choosing the length of z to exceed the sum of the lengths of all vectors chosen up to that stage.

In conclusion, $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ can be constructed by colouring regular orbits of $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ acting on itself. However, any approach to demonstrating links between $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ and Cartan triality based on $\mathbb{O}$ that requires a fixed-point-free action, is likely to be thwarted because $G(2) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{O})$ $(= \mathrm{Spin}(7) \cap \mathrm{Spin}(7) \subset \mathrm{Spin}(8))$ and thus there will always be stabilized points; the Lie algebra of G_2 is the triality-invariant part of the Lie algebra of $\mathrm{SO}(8)$. Another way to see this is to note that if $e_0 = 1, e_1, \ldots, e_7$ are the units of the octonion algebra then $e_i e_j = -\delta_{ij} + \sigma_{ijk} e^k$ and $G(2)$ stabilizes the coefficients in the completely antisymmetric σ_{ijk}. (We should note that the complex Lie group $G(2)$ has two real forms, only one of which is compact, and it is the compact form that can be lifted to the universal covering $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ of $\mathrm{SO}(7)$; the compact group $G(2)$ decomposes the 8-dimensional irreducible real *spin representation* into the trivial and the 7-dimensional representation.

Any condition such as the existence of fixed points is a constraint on the randomness of the edge-colouring. By the above results and by Theorem A.66 of Appendix 9, the existence of fixed points creates an ambiguity in colouring and thus spoils our attempt to link the colour triality of $\mathfrak{R}^t$ with Cartan triality, and this is likely to be equally true of different attempts to create links via lattices and 3-nets.

For more graphs represented by roots of $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$, but in a different context, see [**74**, p. 103].

In the next two sections we will take a somewhat different approach to proving the Cartan Triality of $\mathfrak{R}^t$.

5. Groups with Triality

A *group with triality* is a group G with automorphisms ρ and σ satisfying

$$\rho^3 = \sigma^2 = (\rho\sigma)^2 = 1$$

and the *triality identity*

$$[g,\sigma][g,\sigma]^\rho[g,\sigma]^{\rho^2} = 1$$

for all $g \in G$, where $[g,\sigma] = g^{-1}g^\sigma$.

Obviously, $\langle \rho, \sigma \rangle$ is a homomorphic image of Sym(3). More precisely, fix a homomorphism $h : \mathrm{Sym}(3) \to \mathrm{Aut}(G)$ and identify ρ, σ with their images under h; then G is a *group with operators* Sym(3). The triality identity is independent of a particular choice of ρ and σ [**181**].

The study of abstract groups with triality was begun by Doro [**181**] following Glauberman [**244**]. A discussion this concept is given in [**269**]; see also Appendix 14.

The only finite simple groups with triality are $D_4(q)$ [**357**]. *So there is a sense in which the concept of a group with triality is a generalization of Cartan triality. In fact the origin of the name "group with triality" as well as the motivating example is Cartan's triality group (Appendix 13).*

Examples

(1) Any group is a group with triality in a trivial way, taking ρ and σ to be the identity automorphism.
(2) If G is a group with triality, and H a subgroup invariant under ρ and σ, then H is also a group with triality.

(3) Let H be an abelian group of exponent 3, and G the semidirect product of H with an involution t inverting H. Take ρ to be the inner automorphism induced by an element $h \in H$, and σ the inner automorphism induced by t. The relations satisfied by ρ and σ are clear. We have $[g,\sigma] \in H$, and so this element has order 3 and is fixed by ρ. So G is a group with triality. By the first example, H is also a group with triality. (Note that ρ acts trivially on H.)

(4) In particular, Sym(3), acting on itself by inner automorphisms, is a group with triality.

(5) Let A be any group, and define permutations ρ and σ of $G = A \times A$ by

$$(x,y)^\rho = (y, y^{-1}x^{-1}), \qquad (x,y)^\sigma = (y,x).$$

It is easily checked that σ is an automorphism of order 2. Also ρ has order 3, since

$$(x,y)^{\rho^2} = (y^{-1}x^{-1}, xyy^{-1}) = (y^{-1}x^{-1}, x),$$

and so

$$(x,y)^{\rho^3} = (x, x^{-1}xy) = (x,y).$$

The triality identity is satisfied, since we have

$$(x,y)(y,y^{-1}x^{-1})(y^{-1}x^{-1},x) = (1,1).$$

If A is abelian, then ρ is also an automorphism and $(\rho\sigma)^2 = 1$. So, if A is abelian, then $G = A \times A$ is a group with triality.

(6) In particular, the Klein 4-group (whose automorphism group is Sym(3)) is a group with triality.

(7) Sym(3) is a subgroup of Sym(4), and so acts on it by conjugation. But Sym(4) is not a group with triality. For we may take $\rho = (1,2,3)$ and $\sigma = (1,2)$. If $g = (2,4)$, then $[g,\sigma] = (2,1,4)$, and so $[g,\sigma][g,\sigma]^\rho[g,\sigma]^{\rho^2} = (2,1,4)(3,2,4)(1,3,4) = (2,3)(1,4)$. This example also shows that, if G is a group with an action of Sym(3), then the set of elements of G satisfying the triality identity is not necessarily a subgroup of G. For both the Klein group and Sym(3) satisfy the identity, and their product is Sym(4).

(8) If S is a nonabelian simple group then the wreath product $S \operatorname{Wr} \mathrm{Sym}(3) = (S_1 \times S_2 \times S_3) \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ is a group with triality [**265**], where the base group $S_1 \times S_2 \times S_3$ has automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(S) \operatorname{Wr} \mathrm{Sym}(3) = (\mathrm{Aut}(S_1) \times \mathrm{Aut}(S_2) \times \mathrm{Aut}(S_3)) \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(3)$. See also [**181**] and [**407**].

A good reference to the triality of the 8-dimensional orthogonal group is [**228**].

Let G be a group with automorphisms ρ and σ satisfying $\rho^3 = \sigma^2 = (\rho\sigma)^2 = 1$. For $g \in G$, $\sigma, \rho \in \mathrm{Sym}(3)$, let $\Phi(g) = [g,\sigma][g,\sigma]^\rho[g,\sigma]^{\rho^2}$ be the triality identity. So G is a group with triality if and only if $\Phi(G) = 1$ for all group elements $g \in G$. If $\Phi(g) = 1\ \forall g \in G$ and $H, K < G$ are both groups with triality with the same σ and ρ, then $\Phi(hk) = 1\ \forall h \in H, k \in K$.

The following simple propositions give a taste of the group theory.

6.15. Proposition. *A subgroup $K \leq G$ is $\langle \rho, \sigma \rangle$–invariant if for $k \in K$, $[\sigma, k] = 1$.*

Proof. An easy calculation shows $\Phi(k) = (\sigma^k(\sigma\rho^2))^3 = ([k,\sigma]\rho^2)^3$ from which we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(k^\sigma) &= ([k^\sigma,\sigma]\rho^2)^3 \\ &= ((\sigma^{-1}k\sigma)^{-1}\sigma^{-1}(\sigma^{-1}k\sigma)\sigma\rho^2)^3 \\ &= (\sigma^{-1}k^{-1}\sigma k\rho^2)^3 \\ &= ([\sigma,k]\rho^2)^3.\end{aligned}$$

So if $[\sigma, k] = 1$ then $\Phi(k^\sigma) = 1$.

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(k^\rho) &= ([k^\rho,\sigma]\rho^2)^3 \\ &= (\rho^{-1}k^{-1}\rho\sigma^{-1}\rho^{-1}k\rho\sigma\rho^2)^3 \\ &= (\rho^{-1}k^{-1}\sigma\rho k\sigma\rho)^3\end{aligned}$$

because $\rho\sigma = \sigma\rho^2 \Leftrightarrow \rho\sigma\rho^{-1} = \sigma\rho$. If $[\sigma, k] = 1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(k^\rho) &= (\rho^{-1}k^{-1}\sigma\rho\sigma k\rho)^3 \\ &= (\rho^{-1}k^{-1}\rho^{-1}k\rho)^3 \\ &= 1.\end{aligned}$$

□

6.16. Proposition. *Let G be a group with triality. If $H, K \leq G$, $[\sigma, h] = 1$, and K and G are triality groups with the same ρ, σ then $\Phi(hk) = 1\ \forall h \in H, k \in K$.*

Proof. $\Phi(hk) = ([(hk),\sigma]\rho^{-1})^3$. If $[\sigma, h] = 1$ then $\Phi(hk) = \Phi(k) = 1$. □

In particular if $h, k \in C_G(\sigma)$ then $\langle hk \rangle \in C_G(\sigma)$. This potentially gives us a way of constructing a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ which is generated by those elements in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ that centralize the transpositions making up σ, and which is also a group with triality. One way to proceed then is to define $S := \{g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) : \Phi(g) = 1\}$ and to search for a large subgroup contained in S and invariant under σ and ρ. In the next section we turn to a specific realization of this.

6. Split Extension of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$

Our aim is firstly to construct $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ in such a way as to show that there is a group isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ acting as a group of automorphisms of the graph, and secondly to prove the semidirect product $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) := \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) \rtimes T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ where $T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$.

6.17. Theorem. *There is a construction of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ having a group isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ acting as an automorphism group.*

Proof. The vertex set of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is countably infinite so we can label its elements by $\mathbb{N}$.

First we prove the existence of an edge-colour transposition σ and its normalizing action on $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$. We do not strictly need this step and can go straight to demonstrating the semiregular action of a group isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$ on 6-sets of vertices, but we do so in order to illustrate the method which would not work if there were only 2 colours.

For concreteness, let $\sigma = (0\ 1)\ (2\ 3)\ \ldots$ represent vertex permutations. Colour edges so that we get $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, take $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ to be the vertex permutation that induces a transposition $(\mathfrak{bg})$ of edge colours. Let the edge $\{2i, 2i{+}1\}$ have colour $\mathfrak{r}$. Choose the colour of edge $\{2i, 2j\}$ randomly from respectively $\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}$ or $\mathfrak{g}$ and then the edge $\{2i+1, 2j+1\}$ will be coloured respectively $\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{g}$ or $\mathfrak{b}$. The edge colours on $\{2i, 2j+1\}$ and $\{2i+1, 2j\}$ will be similarly transposed with each other. We need to show that the resulting graph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. Let U, V, W be finite disjoint vertex sets and choose a vertex z, say $z = 2p$, not lying in any 2-cycle containing points of U, V or W (2-cycle as we are considering σ). Attach z to $2i$ and $2i+1$ with edges whose colour is arbitrarily chosen. Colour the edges joining z to the vertices in $U \cup V \cup W$ at random.



The usual construction of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ goes through and by homogeneity and universality of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, σ acts to normalize $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$.

A treatment for $\rho \in \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g}) \cong \langle \sigma, \rho \mid \sigma^2 = \rho^3 = (\sigma\rho)^3 = 1\rangle$ to the one given for σ will show that ρ normalizes $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$.

Consider the 6–vertex set $\{0,\ldots,5\}$ and parametrise the Sym(3)-action by:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & \rho & \rho^2 & \sigma & \sigma\rho & \sigma\rho^2 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5. \end{array}$$

We colour edges in a Sym(3)-invariant way, in particular with Sym(3) acting on 2-element subsets of itself. Take $\sigma = (\mathfrak{r})(\mathfrak{bg})$ to fix the colour $\mathfrak{r}$, and take $\rho = (\mathfrak{rbg})$. We give edge $\{0,1\}$ the fiducial colour $\mathfrak{r}$. If edge $\{0,1\}$ is $\mathfrak{r}$ then $\{1,2\}$ becomes $\mathfrak{b}$ and $\{2,0\}$ becomes $\mathfrak{g}$. Acting by σ and ρ gives the other twelve edge colours. For example $\{0,3\}\sigma = \{3,0\}$ so the colour of edge $\{0,3\}$ must be fixed by σ, and therefore must be red. Once edge $\{0,1\}$ is specified as $\mathfrak{r}$ the remainder of the edges must be coloured as given in the table in Figure 5:

	0	1	2	3	4	5
0		$\mathfrak{r}$	$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathfrak{r}$	$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathfrak{b}$
1	$\mathfrak{r}$		$\mathfrak{b}$	$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathfrak{b}$	$\mathfrak{r}$
2	$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathfrak{b}$		$\mathfrak{b}$	$\mathfrak{r}$	$\mathfrak{g}$
3	$\mathfrak{r}$	$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathfrak{b}$		$\mathfrak{b}$	$\mathfrak{r}$
4	$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathfrak{b}$	$\mathfrak{r}$	$\mathfrak{b}$		$\mathfrak{g}$
5	$\mathfrak{b}$	$\mathfrak{r}$	$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathfrak{r}$	$\mathfrak{g}$	

FIGURE 5. Deterministic Sym(3)-invariant colouring of 6-vertex clique

To reiterate, if $\{i,j\}$ denotes an edge with colour c and $g \in \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ then we require that edge $\{i^g, j^g\}$ in a semiregular action, has colour c^g in its natural action on $\{\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g}\}$. Consider different orbits $O_k = \{6k,\ldots,6k+5\}$ for Sym(3); the edges within each such set are *deterministically* coloured so as to respect the Sym(3)-action. The randomness comes in because the first vertex of one 6-vertex orbit is *randomly* joined to one vertex of another 6-vertex orbit. This scheme is illustrated in Figure 5, where edge $\{0,1\}$ has a free choice of colours and all other colours are forced, for example the colour of edge $\{0,3\}$ is fixed by σ and is therefore $\mathfrak{r}$.

(There may be other colouring schemes, for example for $l > k$ we might colour the edges $\{6k+j, 6l\}$ for $j = 0,\ldots,5$ *randomly*, whence the colours of the other edges from O_k to O_l are determined by the proper action of Sym(3). In particular if the edge $\{6k+j, 6l\}$ $(j \epsilon \{0,\ldots,5\})$

is coloured randomly, then the edge $\{6k+j, 6l+i\}$ is the image of $\{6k+j', 6l\}$ $(j' \epsilon \{0,\ldots,5\})$ under an element of $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$, this being the element corresponding to i.)

It remains to check that $(*_t)$ holds with probability 1, that is with probability 1 some point $6n$ with n large enough has correct joins to the given finite subset. The usual limiting argument on the product of the orbits, each orbit O_k being considered independently, gives that the probability of not getting $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3^s}\right)^k = 0,$$

where $s = |S| = |U| \cup |V| \cup |W|$. □

A direct proof of the next result using the previous theorem would require the involved step-by-step verification of the triality identity at every stage of the graph extension process. We can avoid this by noting that it follows as a corollary of the loop construction in the next section.

6.18. Theorem. *The group* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ *has a subgroup* G *such that* $(G, T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}))$ *is a group with triality, with* $T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$.

With the topology of pointwise convergence on $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$, a subgroup is dense in this group if it has the same orbits as $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ in the induced action on the set of vertex n-tuples, for all $n \geq 1$. In [**43**], Bhattacharjee and Macpherson, give a construction of a dense locally finite subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$. They build finite vertex induced subgraphs Δ_i of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}) = \bigcup_{i<\omega} \Delta_i$ and build finite groups $\hat{G}_i \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Delta_i)$ such that $\hat{G}_i = G_i^{\Delta_i}$ (the group induced by G_i on Δ_i) for each $i < \omega$. Their method is based on arguments of Herwig and Lascar in [**277**], these being adaptations of Hrushovski's [**292**]), building automorphisms as unions of finite partial automorphisms. Is it possible to interweave this theory together with Theorem 6.17 to a sufficiently random colouring of any finite graph extensions to be executed with repeated verifications of the triality identity to strengthen the previous theorem?

Open Question Does the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ have a dense locally finite subgroup H such that $(H, T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}))$ is a group with triality, with $T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$?

The result can be further strengthened; by Theorem A.45, the pointwise stabilizer of a finite vertex set in the group H if it exists, is both open and dense in the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$. This strengthening may be interesting for future applications where density is insufficient by itself; recall that both $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\sqrt{2}\mathbb{Q}$ are dense in $\mathbb{R}$, but $\mathbb{Q} \cap \sqrt{2}\mathbb{Q} = \varnothing$.

We end the section with a proposition and an application of it.

6.19. PROPOSITION. *If G is a group for which $\zeta(G) = 1$, $S \leq \mathrm{Aut}(G)$, $S \cap \mathrm{Inn}(G) = 1$, and S acts via its embedding in $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$, then $C_{G \rtimes S}(G) = 1$.*

PROOF. Let $c = gs \in C_{G \rtimes S}(G)$. Then the automorphism of G induced by c is trivial, so the outer automorphism induced by s is trivial, where by assumption $s = 1$. Then $c = g \in \zeta(G)$, so $c = 1$. □

Now $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ is simple and so centreless, and if $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^t)) := \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t) \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ denotes the split extension of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ by $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$ then the conditions of the above proposition are satisfied so that we have $C_{\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^t)}(\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)) = 1$. This means that $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ acts faithfully on $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$, so $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^t) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t))$. To show that there is equality here we trace the steps of the previous proposition, as follows.

Let α be any automorphism of $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$, and v a vertex. Then $(G_v)^\alpha$ is a subgroup of countable index, so by the small index property contains the pointwise stabilizer of a finite set; (automorphisms of G map one subgroup of small index in the group to another). But G has just four G_v–G_v double cosets (corresponding to equality and the three edge colours), and one can show that the rank of any other small index subgroup is more than four. For example on red edges, two red edges could be equal, or they could meet at a vertex giving a rank of three corresponding to the three colours on the third edge, or they could be disjoint so giving a further rank of 3^4. So G_v^α is a vertex stabilizer. Thus α is induced by an element of $\mathrm{Sym}(V(\mathfrak{R}^t))$ normalizing G. Such an element must permute the three edge colours, so lies in $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^t)$. So we have proved that

6.20. THEOREM. $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^t) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t) \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$.

Therefore $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ is the full automorphism group of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$.

In the next chapter we return to the subject of extensions of automorphism groups of random graphs of any number of colours.

7. A Loop Construction of $\mathfrak{R}^t$

We have seen that generalizations of the concept of Cayley digraphs exist for a wider range of objects than just groups. Here is another example.

Let Q be a quasigroup and let $E \subseteq Q$. The *quasigroup digraph* $\Gamma = QG(Q, E)$ is defined by vertices $V(\Gamma) = Q$ and edges $A(\Gamma) = \{(u, ue) | u \in Q, e \in E\}$. If $E \subseteq Q$ is right associative that is satisfies

$a(bE) = (ab)E$ for all $a, b \in E$, then Γ is said to be a *quasi-Cayley digraph*.

The following result was proved by Dörfler [**180**]

6.21. THEOREM. *A digraph Γ is regular if and only if it is a quasi-group digraph. Moreover, if $\Gamma = QG(Q, E)$ with E right-associative, then Γ is vertex-transitive.*

Sabidussi showed [**470**] that every vertex-transitive graph is a retract of a Cayley graph; a retract is defined later in the book. Gauyacq found examples of vertex-transitive graphs that are not quasi-Cayley, including an infinite family of Kneser graphs. She proved a theorem that gave a condition on the vertex set of a connected graph to be quasi-Cayley [**235**][**352**].

In [**329**], Kelarev and Praeger study analogues of Cayley graphs for semigroups and show that they sometimes enjoy properties analogous to those of the Cayley graphs of groups.

We now undergo our own study pertaining to infinite random graphs.

A Cayley graph for a group G can be defined either as

(a) a graph on the vertex set G admitting the action of G by right multiplication as a group of automorphisms;

or

(b) a graph of the form $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ with vertex set G and edges $\{g, sg\}$ for $g \in G, s \in S$, where S is an inverse-closed subset of $G\backslash\{1\}$.

Clearly (a) is the "natural" definition but there are problems applying it if G is a loop. Indeed, if G is nonassociative then (b) does not imply (a), since right multiplication by h would take the edge $\{g, sg\}$ to $\{gh, (sg)h\}$, which is not necessarily the same as $\{gh, s(gh)\}$. So for loops we have to abandon (a) and use (b) as a definition.

Before continuing with Cayley graphs of loops, we specify one more concept.

A *normal Cayley graph* of a group is one that admits both left and right multiplications by its elements as automorphisms. The condition for $\mathrm{Cay}(X, S)$ to be a normal Cayley graph for a group X is that $xy^{-1} \in S \Rightarrow (ax)(ay)^{-1} \in S = a(xy^{-1})a^{-1} \in S$, that is S is closed under conjugation. Therefore an equivalent definition [**108**] is that a Cayley graph $\mathrm{Cay}(X, S)$ on a group X is *normal* if $S \subseteq X$ is a normal subset (one fixed by conjugation by all elements of X); for example Cayley graphs for abelian groups are normal. So if a group G has $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ as a normal Cayley graph then $\{G\}\backslash\{1\} = S_{\mathfrak{r}} \sqcup S_{\mathfrak{b}} \sqcup S_{\mathfrak{g}}$, where each of $S_{\mathfrak{r}}, S_{\mathfrak{b}}, S_{\mathfrak{g}}$ are both inverse-closed and *conjugation-closed* sets of elements. More on conjugation-closure is given in Lemma 6.25(b). Note that because a

graph can be isomorphic to the Cayley graph of more than one group, and the condition of normality depends on the group rather than being a graph-theoretic property, then normality is effectively a joint property of the graph and the group.

In a Cayley graph for a general loop the above two definitions are not equivalent. Because of the nonassociativity of loop multiplication, to claim that a Cayley graph for Moufang loops is invariant under right or left multiplication means that extra conditions must be imposed.

We need to find conditions on countably infinite loops that ensure that the Cayley graphs representing these loops are isomorphic to m-coloured random graphs. The condition in question turns out to be the same as the one for groups. Recall from [**103**] the following result for countable groups.

6.22. THEOREM. *The following three conditions on the countable group G are equivalent:*

(a) some Cayley graph of G is isomorphic to the random graph;

(b) with probability 1, a random Cayley graph of G is isomorphic to the random graph;

(c) for any two finite disjoint subsets U and V of G, there exists $z \in G$ such that, for all $u \in U, v \in V$, we have $(zu^{-1})^2 \neq vu^{-1}$.

This theorem shows that if G is any regular permutation group, then either no G-invariant graph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ or almost all are. It can be shown using a combination of the square root condition times C_∞ that every countable group is a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

The theorem readily generalizes to more than two colours by considering the colours pairwise. In generalizing the two-colour case we say that a group is $\mathfrak{R}_m$*-genic* if it satisfies this theorem with the following condition: for all m-tuples $(U_1, \ldots, U_m)$ of finite pairwise disjoint subsets, $\exists z$ such that if u, v belong to distinct sets U_i, U_j then $(zu^{-1})^2 \neq vu^{-1}$. This condition appears to get stronger as m increases, but does it really? That is, is there a group which satisfies it for m but not for $m-1$? More concretely, consider the following three conditions:

$(*)_2$ for finite disjoint U, V $\exists z$ such that $\forall u, v$ $(zu^{-1})^2 \neq vu^{-1}$.

$(*)_m$ for finite disjoint $U_1, \ldots, U_m$ $\exists z$ such that $\forall u \in U_i, v \in U_j (i \neq j)$ $(zu^{-1})^2 \neq vu^{-1}$.

$(*)_\dagger$ for a finite set U $\exists z$ such that $\forall u, v \in U, u \neq v$ $(zu^{-1})^2 \neq vu^{-1}$.

Certainly the implications $(*)_\dagger \Rightarrow (*)_m \Rightarrow (*)_2$ hold, but whether or not they reverse is an open question.

In terms of Baire category, assuming that G satisfies the $\mathfrak{R}_m$-genic condition, the set of Cayley graphs for G which are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ is residual.

We use the same nomenclature for loops as for groups, and refer to Appendix 14 for the definition of a Moufang loop. So a Cayley graph for the Moufang loop Q takes the form $\mathrm{Cay}(Q, S)$, where the vertices are $q \in Q$ and the inverse-closed subset $S \subseteq Q\backslash\{1\}$ gives the edge set $\{\{q, qs^{-1}\} : q \in Q, s \in S\}$.

6.23. THEOREM. *The following three conditions on the countable Moufang loop Q are equivalent:*

(a) some Cayley graph of Q is isomorphic to the random graph;

(b) with probability 1, a random Cayley graph of Q is isomorphic to the random graph;

(c) for any two finite disjoint subsets U and V of Q, there exists $z \in Q\backslash\{U \cup V\}$ such that, for all $u \in U, v \in V$, we have $(zu^{-1})^2 \neq vu^{-1}$.

PROOF. Clearly (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a).

To show that (a) $\Rightarrow$ (c), let Q be a Moufang loop. Firstly, the identity $a(xy^{-1}) = a(xa) \cdot a^{-1}y^{-1}$ for elements of Q follows because $a(xy^{-1}) = a[x(a(a^{-1}y^{-1}))] = [((ax)a) \cdot (a^{-1}y^{-1})] = a(xa) \cdot a^{-1}y^{-1}$.

Let S be an inverse-closed subset of Q which does not contain the identity. Suppose that $\mathrm{Cay}(Q, S) \cong \mathfrak{R}$, and let U and V be finite disjoint subsets of Q. Choose z according to the property $(*)$. For all $u \in U, v \in V$, if $(zu^{-1})^2 = vu^{-1}$ then $(zu^{-1})(zu^{-1})u = (vu^{-1})u$, so $(zu^{-1})z = v$ giving $zu^{-1} = vz^{-1}$ which leads to $\{z, u\}$ and $\{z, v\}$ being both edges or both non-edges depending on whether or not $zu^{-1} \in S$. Then we deduce that $zu^{-1} \neq vz^{-1}$, so $(zu^{-1})^2 = vu^{-1}$ as required.

To show that (c) $\Rightarrow$ (b), first note that given any U we can always enlarge it by adding a finite number of elements, so there are an infinite number of elements z satisfying (c). For such z, we always have $(zu^{-1})^2 \neq vu^{-1}$. So the probability that z is not correctly joined in a random Cayley graph is at most $1 - \frac{1}{2^m}$, where $m = |U \cup V|$. (An example of a smaller probability would be if, say $(zu_1^{-1})^2 = u_2u_1^{-1}$, so that $\{z, u_1\}$ and $\{z, u_2\}$ are both edges or non-edges). Given finitely many such z, say $z_1, \ldots, z_n$, only finitely many more z for which the joins of z to $U \cup V$ are dependent on those of $z_1, \ldots, z_n$, for such dependence would require that $zx^{-1} = (z_iy^{-1})^{\pm 1}$ for some i and some $x, y \in U \cup V$, and each such equation has a unique solution in z. So we can construct an infinite sequence of z for which these events are independent, and conclude that with probability 1 some z is correctly joined. There are only countably many choices of U and V so (b) follows.

□

This theorem shows that either no Cayley graph for Q is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ or almost all are, and the proof is a simple variant to the argument

given in [**103**] for the case of groups. The theorem for Moufang loops readily generalizes to more than two colours by considering the colours pairwise.

We work with Moufang loops whose elements are assumed to have square roots [**75**, p.121]. For $l \in L$, define the *square-root set* $\sqrt{l} := \{x \in L : x^2 = l\}$. If $l \neq 1$ it is *non-principal*. A *translate* of a square-root set is obtained by multiplying it on the right by a fixed loop element. The following sufficient condition to be found in [**103**] for groups, follows as a corollary to the above theorem applied to Moufang loops.

6.24. Corollary. *If the countable Moufang loop L cannot be expressed as the finite union of translates of non-principal square-root sets together with a finite set, then L is $\mathfrak{R}_m$-genic.*

Note that left and right multiplications are bijections in a loop, for example $xa = ya \Rightarrow x = y$.

6.25. Lemma.
(a) If $\mathrm{RMlt}(Q)$ *is the group generated by all the right multiplications on Q, then* $\mathrm{RMlt}(Q) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$, *where* Γ *is any Cayley graph for Q.*
(b) If $\mathrm{LMlt}(Q)$ *is the group generated by all the left multiplications on Q, and if in* $\mathrm{Cay}(Q, S)$ *we have that* $xy^{-1} \in S \Rightarrow [(ax)y^{-1}]a^{-1} \in S$ *then* $\mathrm{Cay}(Q, S)$ *is a normal Cayley graph admitting* $\mathrm{LMlt}(Q)$.

Proof. (a) For the set of elements $S \subseteq Q$, join two elements $x, y \in S$ to form an edge denoted $x \sim y$ if and only if $xy^{-1} \in S$. In order to show that $\mathrm{RMlt}(a) \in \mathrm{Aut}(Q)$ we must prove that $(xa)(ya)^{-1} = xy^{-1}$ for elements of Q. Using the identity $a(xy^{-1}) = a(xa) \cdot a^{-1}y^{-1}$, we find that,

$$a^{-1}[a(xy^{-1})] = a^{-1}[a(xa) \cdot a^{-1}y^{-1}] \Rightarrow$$

$$xy^{-1} = a^{-1}[(a(xa)) \cdot (a^{-1}y^{-1})] = a^{-1}[(a(xa)) \cdot (ya)^{-1}] =$$

$$a^{-1}[(ax)a \cdot (ya)^{-1})] = a^{-1}[a(x(a \cdot (ya)^{-1}))] = x(a \cdot (ya)^{-1}) =$$

$$(xaa^{-1})[a(ya)^{-1}] = (xa)a^{-1}(aa^{-1})[a(ya)^{-1}] =$$

$$(xa)(a^{-1}a)a^{-1}[a(ya)^{-1}] = (xa)(ya)^{-1}.$$

(b) We can assume that $a \neq x \neq y^{-1}$, because if any two are equal then their composition associates, and we revert to the group case. More precisely, by Moufang's theorem in a Moufang loop any three elements which associate generate a group, and by corollary every Moufang loop is diassociative (that is, any pair of elements whatsoever

generates a group). It also follows from Artin's diassociativity theorem any two elements of a Moufang loop generate a subgroup. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(ax)(ay)^{-1} &= [(ax)a](a^{-1}a)[a^{-1}(ay)^{-1}]\\ &= [a(xa)](a^{-1}(ay)^{-1})\\ &= (([a(xa)]a^{-1})y^{-1})a^{-1}\\ &= [(ax)y^{-1}]a^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

thus giving the condition that $xy^{-1} \in S \Rightarrow [(ax)y^{-1}]a^{-1} \in S$ for $\mathrm{LMlt}(Q) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$. If this condition, which we shall describe as *conjugation-closure*, is satisfied together with (a) then it follows that $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q) = \langle \mathrm{LMlt}(Q), \mathrm{RMlt}(Q)\rangle \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$. □

The condition for a Cayley graph of a loop to be normal given in Lemma 6.25(b) is the loop equivalent to the one for groups given in the paragraph before the Lemma. For a Moufang loop Q, let $\zeta(Q) := C(Q) \cap \mathrm{Nuc}(Q)$ be its centre, where $C(Q)$ is the *Moufang centre* and $\mathrm{Nuc}(Q)$ is the *Moufang nucleus*; (see Appendix 14 for the definitions).

Let $K(Q)$ be the class of Moufang loops Q, such that

$$1 < \zeta(Q) \leq C(Q) < Q,$$

$$exp(C(Q)) = 3,$$

and,

$$Q \ncong \zeta(Q) \times L, \text{for some subloop } L.$$

Let $K'(Q)$ be the (large and general) class of Moufang loops that are *not* members of $K(Q)$. J. D. Phillips proved the following theorem [**431**] [**432**],

6.26. Theorem. *For a Moufang loop Q belonging to $K'(Q)$,* $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$ *is a group with triality if and only if*

$$\zeta(Q) = \mathrm{Nuc}(Q),$$

$$exp(C(Q)) = 3, and$$

$$Q \cong \zeta(Q) \times L, for\ some\ subloop\ L\ with\ \mathrm{Nuc}(L) = 1; or\ C(Q) = Q.$$

It is also known that there is an outer automorphism ρ of order 3 of the loop's multiplication group (see Appendix 14) acting as

$$L(q)^{\rho} = R(q), \quad R(q)^{\rho} = P(q), \quad P(q)^{\rho} = L(q) \qquad (\dagger)$$

where $q \in Q$ and $P(q) = R(q)L(q) = L(q)R(q)$, and an involutory automorphism acting as

$$R(q)^{\sigma} = L(q^{-1}), \quad L(q)^{\sigma} = R(q^{-1}), \quad P(q)^{\sigma} = R(q)^{-1}L(q)^{-1}, \qquad (\dagger\dagger)$$

where $L(q)^{-1} = L(q^{-1}), R(q)^{-1} = R(q^{-1}), P(q)^{-1} = P(q^{-1})$.

Also $\langle \rho, \sigma \rangle \cong \mathrm{Sym}(3)$.

The action of ρ in the next result, which is equivalent to the edge-colour permuting 3-cycle τ in Theorem 6.6, is assumed to have no fixed points except the identity. That we can make this assumption is shown in the dialogue after the proof of the theorem.

Doro proved [**181**] that each Moufang loop with trivial nucleus has a multiplication group with triality. We will use this fact in the next theorem. We aim to produce a construction of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ in which the colour $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ as well as the generalized Cartan Sym(3) are present, in order that further research can potentially unveil the relationship between them.

6.27. Theorem. *Let $(Q, \cdot)$ be a countably infinite Moufang loop with trivial nucleus and trivial Moufang centre, and satisfying the conditions of Theorem 6.23 and Theorem 6.26.*

We can find $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ as a Cayley graph for $(Q, \cdot)$ such that $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}) := \langle \rho, \sigma \rangle$ acts so as to permute the colours.

Proof. The topological space in which the Baire category argument takes place is the space of paths in a ternary tree representing a countable sequence of choices. The complete metric space which is required for the application of this theory arises from paths in rooted trees of countable height. This space is effectively isomorphic to that used to show that the set of Cayley graphs for $C_2 * C_2 * C_2$ which are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is residual in a conditional set, so we do not need to repeat those arguments.

Partition the non-identity inverse pairs of elements of Q into 3 inverse-closed, conjugation-closed classes S_1, S_2, S_3 (corresponding to edges joined to the identity by red, blue and green colours), such that

$$q \in S_i \Rightarrow q^{-1} \in S_i \qquad (i = 1, 2, 3) \qquad (a)$$

If (A) we assign pairs of loop elements to one of three colours, red if $ql^{-1} \in S_1$, blue if $ql^{-1} \in S_2$ and green if $ql^{-1} \in S_3$, and (B) there is an order 3 group element ρ such that

$$q \in S_1 \Rightarrow q^{\rho} \in S_2, q^{\rho^2} \in S_3, \qquad (b)$$

and there is an order 2 group element σ such that

$$\sigma : S_1 \to S_2 \to S_1,\ S_3 \to S_3, \qquad (c)$$

then with the loop elements as graph vertices and pairs of elements as graph edges randomly coloured, we must show that the set of normal Cayley graphs representing the loop $(Q, \cdot)$ which are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is residual in the set satisfying condition $(a), (b)$ and (c).

We must choose S_1, S_2, S_3 in such a way as to ensure that the resulting object is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. The existence of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is equivalent to the satisfaction of the following condition:

$(*_t)$ If U, V and W are finite disjoint sets of graph vertices, then there exists a vertex z, joined to every vertex in U with a red edge, to every vertex in V with a blue edge, and joined to every vertex in W with a green edge.

(i) We claim that $\exists z$ such that no $sz^{-1}(s \in S)$ has yet been assigned one of the three colours. For if Φ is the finite set whose elements have already been so assigned, then $sz^{-1} \in \Phi$ so only the finitely many z, those of the form $\phi^{-1}s, \phi^{-1} \in \Phi$ need to be excluded. Nonassociativity does not arise in compositions of pairs of Moufang elements.

(ii) We want to eliminate z for which $uz^{-1} = (vz^{-1})^{-1}$ for $u \in U, v \in V$. For such elements then $zu^{-1} = vz^{-1}$ (because Moufang loops have the inverse property and their elements have two-sided inverses). Substituting $z = z'u$, gives

$$(z'u)u^{-1} = v(u^{-1}z'^{-1}) \Rightarrow z' = v(u^{-1}z'^{-1}) \Rightarrow u^{-1}z' = u^{-1}(v(u^{-1}z'^{-1}))$$
$$\Rightarrow (u^{-1}z')z' = (u^{-1}v)u^{-1} \Rightarrow u^{-1}(z')^2 = u^{-1}(vu^{-1}) \Rightarrow$$
$$\Rightarrow z' = (vu^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}} \Rightarrow z = (vu^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}u.$$

By Theorem 6.23, this is precisely the form of z that we must eliminate in order to be able to form any Cayley graph from elements of a loop.

Let $u \in S_1, v \in S_2, w \in S_3$. We need to assume that the images of all $uz^{-1}, vz^{-1}, wz^{-1}$ under σ, ρ and ρ^2 have not yet had colours assigned to them, so that we can assign them colours appropriately; to achieve randomness we must have a free choice of colours.

Note: the elements σ, ρ and ρ^2 act on $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$ *and not on Q.*

This leads us to consider the following cases.

(iii) We need to exclude those z for which $(zu^{-1})^{\rho} = zv^{-1}$. Now $z^{\rho}u^{-\rho} = zv^{-1} \Rightarrow z^{-1}(z^{\rho}u^{-\rho}) = z^{-1}(zv^{-1}) = v^{-1} \Rightarrow z^{\rho}[z^{-1}(z^{\rho}u^{-\rho})] = z^{\rho}v^{-1} \Rightarrow [(z^{\rho}z^{-1})z^{\rho}]u^{-\rho} = z^{\rho}v^{-1} \Rightarrow z^{2\rho-1}u^{-\rho} = z^{\rho}v^{-1} \Rightarrow z^{\rho-1}u^{-\rho} = v^{-1} \Rightarrow$

$$z^{\rho-1} = v^{-1}u^{-\rho^{-1}} \qquad (\alpha)$$

As a check, substituting $z^{\rho-1}$ from (α) in the original equation for $(zu^{-1})^{\rho}$ gives $z^{\rho}u^{-\rho} = (zz^{\rho-1})u^{-\rho} = (zv^{-1}u^{-\rho^{-1}})u^{-\rho} = zv^{-1}$.

By disqualifying the z of the form $z = (v^{-1}u^{-\rho^{-1}})^{(\rho-1)^{-1}}$, we can achieve the required inequality.

(iv) We need to exclude those z for which $(zu^{-1})^{\rho^2} = zw^{-1}$. But this is just $(zu^{-1})^{\rho^{-1}} = zw^{-1}$. By comparison with (iii) we see that we need

to disqualify z of the form $z = (w^{-1}u^{-\rho})^{(\rho^{-1}-1)^{-1}}$ in order to satisfy the required inequality.

(v) We need to exclude those z for which $(zu^{-1})^{\rho} = (zv^{-1})^{-1}$. This is simply $(zu^{-1})^{\rho^{-1}} = zv^{-1}$, so we require $z \neq (v^{-1}u^{-\rho})^{(\rho^{-1}-1)^{-1}}$.

(vi) We need to exclude those z for which $(zu^{-1})^{\rho^2} = (zw^{-1})^{-1}$. This implies $(zu^{-1})^{\rho} = zw^{-1}$, so we eliminate $z = (w^{-1}u^{-\rho^{-1}})^{(\rho-1)^{-1}}$.

(vii) We need to exclude those z for which $((zv^{-1})^{-1})^{\rho} = zw^{-1}$. Thus $(zv^{-1})^{-\rho} = zw^{-1}$, so we exclude $z = (w^{-1}v^{\rho^{-1}})^{(-\rho-1)^{-1}}$.

(viii) We need to exclude those z for which $(zu^{-1})^{\rho^2} = (vw^{-1})$, that is $z = (vw^{-1})^{\rho}u$.

(ix) We need to exclude those z for which $((zv^{-1})^{-1})^{\rho} = (vw^{-1})$, that is $z = (vw^{-1})^{-\rho^{-1}}v$.

(x) Consider $(uw^{-1})^{\rho} = (u_1w_1^{-1})$. This relation has already been determined and is only possible if $uw^{-1} \in S_1$ (respectively S_2, S_3) implies $u_1w_1^{-1} \in S_2$ (respectively S_3, S_1).

Next we need to show that the involution $\sigma : S_1 \to S_2 \to S_1$, $S_3 \to S_3$ does not affect the satisfaction of $(*_t)$.

(xi) We need to exclude those z for which $(zu^{-1})^{\sigma} = zv^{-1}$. By comparison with (iii) we see that we need to disqualify z of the form $z = (v^{-1}u^{-\sigma^{-1}})^{(\sigma-1)^{-1}}$.

(xii) We need to exclude those z for which $(zu^{-1})^{\sigma} = (zv^{-1})^{-1}$, that is for which $(zu^{-1})^{\sigma^{-1}} = zv^{-1}$. Thus we need to disqualify z of the form $z = (v^{-1}u^{-\sigma})^{(\sigma^{-1}-1)^{-1}}$.

(xiii) We need to exclude those z for which $(zw_1^{-1})^{\sigma} = zw_2^{-1}$. By comparison with (iii) we see that we need to disqualify z of the form $z = (w_2^{-1}w_1^{-\sigma^{-1}})^{(\sigma-1)^{-1}}$.

(xiv) We need to exclude those z for which $(zu^{-1})^{\sigma} = vw^{-1}$. It is immediate that we need to disqualify any z of the form $z = (vw^{-1})^{\sigma^{-1}}u$.

(xv) Consider $(u_1v_1^{-1})^{\sigma} = (u_2v_2^{-1})$. This relation has already been determined and is only possible if $u_1v_1^{-1} \in S_1$ (respectively S_2) implies $u_2v_2^{-1} \in S_2$ (respectively S_1), and conversely.

All other possibilities fit into one of these categories.

To summarize, for any three finite disjoint sets U, V and $W \subset Q$, there exists $z \in Q \backslash S$ such that, for all $u \in U, v \in V, w \in W$, we can find $uz^{-1}, vz^{-1}, wz^{-1}$ which have not yet been assigned to S_1, S_2, S_3 and for which $(uz^{-1})^{\rho} \neq (vz^{-1})^{\pm 1}$, $(vz^{-1})^{\rho} \neq (wz^{-1})^{\pm 1}$, and $(wz^{-1})^{\rho} \neq (uz^{-1})^{\pm 1}$, so that the images of $uz^{-1}, vz^{-1}, wz^{-1}$ under ρ, ρ^2 have not been pre-assigned. Now assign all uz^{-1} to S_1, all vz^{-1} to S_2 and all wz^{-1} to S_3.

In total, we have excluded only finitely many z, so infinitely many choices remain for us to satisfy the required 1-point extension. The

set $\chi(A, B, C)$ of Cayley graphs is dense. The Baire category theorem implies that the intersection of all the sets $\chi(A, B, C)$ is residual and hence non-empty. Hence we have built a copy of $\mathfrak{R}^t$. □

Assume that the relevant criteria are satisfied and that we are working in a normal Cayley graph and so all three types of multiplication of $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$, left, right and bi-multiplication are automorphisms of Q. Then it is immediate from the last theorem that

$$\mathrm{Mlt}(Q) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t).$$

Open Question

Can we find an action on the vertices of $\mathfrak{R}^t$ that induces a normalising action on $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$.

Open Question

By [**430**, Theorem III.2.7], if two loops are isotopic then all of their respective multiplication groups, as well as their inner mapping groups and nuclei are isomorphic. Does the multiplication group determine the centre, nucleus and other loop properties? So is it possible to conclude that if Q satisfies the conditions of the theorem then so does any loop isotopic to Q?

The associative law holds for mappings so $L(q)$ and $R(q)$ are associative, even though the loop composition is not. Because they are permutations, $L(q), R(q)$ lie in $\mathrm{Sym}(Q)$. For elements lying outside the Moufang centre, $L(q), R(q)$ and $P(q)$ are mappings (and thus always single-valued) from $Q \backslash C(Q) \to \mathrm{Sym}(Q)$; L, P, R are also 1–1 and are pairwise disjoint. So by (†) above, ρ acts fixed-point-freely on the Moufang loop multiplication groups, other than on the identity. (However [**433**] ρ fixes both $R(c)$ for an order 3 element c of the Moufang centre, and automorphic *inner mappings* of a loop with trivial nucleus. The inner mapping group $I(Q)$ comprises those elements of $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$ that stabilize the identity and form a subgroup of $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$ generated by $R(p, q) = R(p)R(q)R(pq)^{-1}, L(p, q) = L(p)L(q)L(qp)^{-1}$, and $T(p) = R(p)L(p)^{-1}$).

Whilst inner mappings are not always loop automorphisms, the collection of all inner automorphisms of a loop Q form a subgroup of $I(Q)$ [**430**, pp. 27, 28]).

Not much is known about infinite Moufang loops, but notice that for the previous theorem we chosen a loop that is totally non-commutative and nonassociative, and therefore a loop that is far away from having a group structure as possible. What if $(Q, \cdot)$ was a group? Then

$\mathrm{Nuc}(Q) = Q$ as all the elements associate. So by Theorem 6.26, $\mathrm{Nuc}(Q) = \zeta(Q) = C(Q) = Q$. So the group must be abelian, and so $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q) = Q$; of necessity the group is of exponent 3. As we noted in example (5) in the section on groups with triality, for an abelian group A, the group with triality is, using additive notation, $A \oplus A$. Then the action of ρ is $\rho : (x, 0) \mapsto (0, x) \mapsto (-x, -x) \mapsto (0, -x) + (x, x) = (x, 0)$. Also $\rho : (x, y) \mapsto (-y, x - y)$ which is fixed if and only if $x = -y$ and $x - y = y \Rightarrow x = 2y = -y$. Also $(x, -x) \mapsto (x, x + x) = (x, -x)$. So ρ has no fixed points outside the Moufang centre.

If instead of removing nonassociativity from Theorem 6.27 we keep nonassociativity and remove non-commutativity, the theorem still fails. A commutative Moufang loop (CML) (see Appendix 14) would fail to satisfy the last theorem. If Q were a group, then $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$ admits ρ only if Q is abelian of exponent 3 [**431**, p. 1485]. However if Q were a CML, necessarily of exponent 3 [**431**, Lemma 1], then the triality of $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$ is trivial [**431**, Theorem 3] (because then $L(q) = R(q) = P(q)$). So we take $Q \in K'(Q)$ to be such that $\zeta(Q) = \mathrm{Nuc}(Q) = C(Q) = 1$, and we can further assume if necessary that there are an infinite number of elements of unbounded exponent in Q. That Moufang loops with trivial nucleus have multiplication groups with triality was shown in [**181**].

It is immediate that the multiplication group of the Moufang loop of the last theorem is a group with triality, that is non-trivial on all elements.

Let us recap where we are and where we believe further work could produce elegant results.

Open Question

We have already constructed $\mathfrak{R}^t$ *so that* $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$. *We would like to find an action on the vertices of* $\mathfrak{R}^t$ *that induces a normalizing action on* $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$.

Let us recap where we are and what remains to be achieved.

(i) We know that colour $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ acts as outer automorphisms of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$.

(ii) We have a construction that shows that the extension of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ by colour $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$ splits, that is we can realize this $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$ as a subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$ which normalizes $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^t)$.

(iii) We can choose a Moufang loop Q such that it admits triality and has $\mathfrak{R}^t$ as a Cayley graph. Then the Cartan-like triality $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$ acts as outer automorphisms of $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$.

(iv) Can we find a Sym(3) in $\mathrm{Sym}(Q) = \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ normalizing $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$ and inducing the triality Sym(3) on it? If so then this extension splits. (It is possible to build extensions, some non-split and this unique one that splits.) Can we demonstrate that the split extension that normalizes $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$ simultaneously acts on the vertices of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$?

(v) Can we by careful choices in (i) and (ii) find a nice relationship between the two Sym(3)s ($\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$ and the triality Sym(3)). For example can we make them equal? commute?



FIGURE 6. Generalized Cartan triality & $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ triality

Note that in the right-hand side of Figure 6, $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$ can act directly on Q because $\mathrm{Sym}(Q)$ contains both $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r},\mathfrak{b},\mathfrak{g})$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$, and by Theorem 6.20 the first of these groups normalizes the second. There is however no equivalent action on the left-hand side of the diagram. Whilst the generalized Cartan-like group acts on $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$ it cannot act directly on Q, for if we could get $\langle\tilde{\rho},\tilde{\sigma}\rangle$ to act on Q then $L(q^{\tilde{\rho}}) = R(q)$, and for example applying this to the identity, $q^{\tilde{\rho}} = q$ for all $q \in Q$, so $\tilde{\rho} = 1$; or applying this to any $x \in Q$, $(xq)^{\tilde{\rho}} = qx$ so that in the particular case of $x = q$, $qq^{\tilde{\rho}} = qq$ and we reach the same contradiction, since $\tilde{\rho}$ has no fixed points. Thus the two left-hand actions are not transitive and so we cannot have either a direct triality action on the loop nor is there an equivalent of the split extension of the groups on the right.

Although we are asking for a relationship between the colour and Cartan-type trialities, we should note the unusual and unexpected nature of this connection were it to be found. A priori, how do we begin to connect a graph that is countably infinite and whose automorphism

group is uncountably infinite, with a vector space that has dimension 8, and whose quadratic-form-preserving automorphism groups (the orthogonal groups Spin(8), and $P\Omega^+(8,K)$, over *any* field K including a finite field, making this group a finite group)? On another level, picking out the triality graph from the class of all three-edge coloured countable universal homogeneous graphs has probability one, and so this graph is the norm in its class, whereas the 8-dimensional phenomenon is unique to that dimension. It is possible that such a purported connection can be found through the generalized notion of groups with triality. The tantalizing prospect is that in some sense this makes $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ an exceptional object, inheriting its exceptionality from Cartan triality and perhaps originating in the octonions $\mathbb{O}$ [**20**] [**505**].

This is a good place to recall Doro's result, further developed by Hall, that groups with triality and Moufang loops are essentially the same thing, in that nonassociative Moufang loops correspond to simple groups with triality; the group with triality is the multiplicative group of the Moufang loop, though see Appendix 14 for a more detailed explanation of this. Furthermore, as we have already noted in a previous section, the only finite simple groups with triality are $D_4(q)$ [**357**]. *Thus with the construction of the triality-supporting Moufang loop* Q *for which* $\mathrm{Mlt}(Q) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ *(Theorem 6.27), and with the subsequent implication of a subgroup of* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ *as a group with triality (Theorem 6.17), we are able to give some justification to the name "triality graph" that we have given to the graph that we have symbolised* $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$*, in the hope that in the future some connection to (a generalized version of) the outer automorphism triality discovered by É. Cartan, and the colour triality may be demonstrated.*

Open Question Is the multiplication group of our loop in theorem 6.27 simple? (The overgroup $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ is simple).

Finally, it is not impossible to connect the number 8 and countable infinity. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ has dimension 8 whilst its universal enveloping algebra has an infinite dimension; though we are not claiming that this link has anything to do with our results.

CHAPTER 7

Random Graph Outer Automorphisms & Variations

In a dream in the Spring of 1951 the word 'automorphism' (taken from mathematics) came flying towards me. This is a word for the picturing of a system on itself, a reflection of the system into itself, for a process, that is, in which the inner symmetry, the connexional richness (relations) of a system reveals itself.

Wolfgang Pauli, *Letter to Jung, 27 February 1952* [**200**, p. 503]

We found that objectivity means invariance with respect to the group of automorphisms. Reality may not always give a clear answer to the question what the actual group of an automorphism is, and for the purpose of some investigations it may be quite useful to replace it by a wider group.

H. Weyl, *Symmetry, Princeton U. P. 1952, p.132*

What we learn from our whole discussion and what has indeed become a guiding principle in modern mathematics is this lesson: *Whatever you have to do with a structure-endowed entity* Σ *try to determine its group of automorphisms*, the group of those element-wise transformations which leave all structural relations undisturbed. You can expect to gain a deep insight into the constitution of Σ in this way.

H. Weyl, *Symmetry, Princeton U. P. 1952, p.144*

In standard terminology, an "outer automorphism" is an automorphism which is not inner; and the "outer automorphism group" is the quotient of an automorphism group by the inner automorphism group.

1. On Extensions of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$

1.1. Introduction. In previous chapters we already looked at the outer automorphism group of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ and now we will begin to develop a systematic theory.

We define an *outer automorphism of an edge-coloured graph* Γ to be a permutation of its edge-colours modulo a permutation preserving

colours acting naturally on the set of colours, which is an element of the quotient group (denoted $\mathrm{TAut}(\Gamma)$) of the group of all graph automorphisms which preserve the partition of $E(\Gamma)$ into colour classes, by the group of all *inner* automorphisms fixing each colour class (denoted $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$). The group of such permutations is the outer automorphism group of the graph, and $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma) \lhd \mathrm{TAut}(\Gamma)$. Therefore the inner automorphism group is the kernel of the action on the set $\mathcal{C}$ of colours, so $\mathrm{TAut}(\Gamma)/\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathcal{C})$.

We shall further clarify this definition below but first we illustrate it with some examples.

Examples

(1) If Γ is a graph with possible edge colours $\mathfrak{r}$ and $\mathfrak{b}$ on a vertex set $V(\Gamma)$ and if $(V(\Gamma), \mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}) \cong (V(\Gamma), \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{r})$ then there is an automorphism of $V(\Gamma)$ interchanging $\mathfrak{r}$ and $\mathfrak{b}$ which is outer. An example of this is the labelled graph in Figure 1 where the solid and dotted lines represent different colours together with the vertex permutation $x \mapsto 2x \pmod 5$, where $x \in \{0, \ldots, 4\}$.



FIGURE 1. Labelled graph with outer automorphisms

(2) An example of an outer automorphism of a graph, is the C_2 vertex permutations that induce transpositions of edges and non-edges in the graph $\mathfrak{R}$. The automorphism groups $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ of the m-coloured random graphs are simple, so are generated by any non-trivial conjugacy class. By analogy with the two-coloured random graph, $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})/\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(m)$ so that $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ normalizes $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ and so is outer; this is essentially because of the universal nature of the injectivity property defining the graphs. Contrast this with the result [**177**, p. 133] that the group of outer automorphisms of a *finite simple* group has a normal series of the form: $A \lhd B \lhd C$

where A is abelian, B/A is cyclic and $C/B \cong 1, \mathrm{Sym}(2)$ or $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$.

Rubin studied [**466**] the reconstruction of $\aleph_0$-categorical structures from their automorphism groups, that is given two such structures M_1, M_2 for which $\mathrm{Aut}(M_1) \cong \mathrm{Aut}(M_2)$ does it follow that the two permutation groups $\langle \mathrm{Aut}(M_1), |M_1| \rangle$ and $\langle \mathrm{Aut}(M_2), |M_2| \rangle$ are isomorphic? This is not the case in general, so a strengthening condition is required. He proved that the isomorphism of the two permutation groups is equivalent to the existence of a bijection $f : |M_1| \to |M_2|$ such that for every $A \subseteq |M_1|^n$, A is $\varnothing$-definable in M_1 if and only if $f(A)$ is $\varnothing$-definable in M_2. A structure M has *no algebraicity* if, for every finite $A \subseteq |M|$ and $a \in |M| - A$, a is not algebraic over A. Let C be the class of $\aleph_0$-categorical structures with no algebraicity, and $M \in C$. Rubin calls the structure M *group-categorical in* C if for every $N \in C$ it is the case that $\mathrm{Aut}(M) \cong \mathrm{Aut}(N) \Rightarrow \langle \mathrm{Aut}(M), |M| \rangle \cong \langle \mathrm{Aut}(N), |N| \rangle$ as permutation groups. The outer automorphism group of the automorphism group of a group-categorical structure is easily determined because then every automorphism of $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ is induced by a permutation of $|M|$. Rubin cites $\mathrm{Out}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(m)$ as an example. For a finite $A \subseteq M$, $a \in M$ is algebraic over A if a lies in a finite orbit of $\mathrm{Aut}(M)_A$. So a structure that has no algebraicity has no finite orbits, for example the random graph. However its line graph does have algebraicity. By a corollary to Whitney's Theorem [**352**, p. 13], which follows also for infinite graphs, the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ and its line graph which have the same automorphism group, though the action on vertices is quite different. That the line graph of the random graph has algebraicity is exemplified as follows. Consider a triangle xyz and let M be the line graph of $\mathfrak{R}$, $A = \{\{x, y\}, \{x, z\}\}$, $a = \{y, z\}$. Fixing x, $\{x, y\}$ and $\{x, z\}$ means that an automorphism can either fix y and z or transpose them. So $\mathrm{Aut}(M)_A$ fixes a.

If $\zeta(G)$ denotes the centre of a group G and $\mathrm{Inn}(G)$ denotes its group of inner automorphisms, then as is well-known $G/\zeta(G) \cong \mathrm{Inn}(G)$. We can make the identification $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \cong \mathrm{Inn}(\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}))$ because $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is simple and so centreless, (otherwise its centre would be a non-trivial normal subgroup). Furthermore, $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is non-abelian, for otherwise given its transitive action on the vertices, this action would in fact be regular, which it certainly is not, for example it is possible to stabilize a vertex and move others; (the possible cycle types are given in Appendix 8). A group G is *complete* if both its centre and outer automorphism groups are trivial, or equivalently the conjugation map $G \to \mathrm{Aut}(G)$ is an isomorphism. Whilst

$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ is not complete because $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \cong \mathrm{Inn}(\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}))$ the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})) \cong \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}) \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ is complete by a theorem of Burnside [**461**, p.414] which states that if G is a non-abelian simple (finite or infinite) group then $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ is complete.

The isomorphism class of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ is residual in the set of all m-coloured complete graphs on a fixed countable vertex set. (See [**90**] for discussion). Truss [**527**] showed that the group of permutations of the vertex set fixing all the colours, $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, is a simple group.

As we stated at the beginning of the section, for any permutation π of the set of colours, let $\mathfrak{R}^{\pi}_{m,\omega}$ be the graph obtained by applying π to the colours. Then $\mathfrak{R}^{\pi}_{m,\omega}$ is countable, universal and homogeneous, and hence isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$. This means that, if $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is the group of permutations of the vertex set which induce permutations of the colours, then $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ induces the symmetric group $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ on the colours; so $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is an extension of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ by $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$.

The first question we consider here is: when does this extension split? In other words, when is there a complement for $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ in $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ (a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ which permutes the colours)? We will show that $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is the automorphism group of the simple group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ (so that the outer automorphism group of this group is $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$).

7.1. Theorem. *The group* $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ *splits over* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ *if and only if* m *is odd.*

7.2. Theorem. *The group* $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ *is the automorphism group of* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$.

1.2. Proof of Theorem 7.1. We show first that the extension does not split if m is even. Let $\pi \in \mathrm{Sym}(m)$ be a fixed-point-free involution; if m is even there will be such a thing. Suppose that the extension splits. There is then an involution acting on $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ inducing this colour permutation. Since we are supposing that a complement exists, let s be an element of this complement acting as $(1,2)(3,4)\cdots(m-1,m)$ on the colours. Then s maps the subgraph with colours $1, 3, \ldots, m-1$ to its complement. But this is impossible, since the edge joining points in a 2-cycle of s has its colour fixed, for an involution simply swaps over the vertices of an edge.

Now suppose that m is odd; we are going to construct a complement.

First, we show that there exists a function f from pairs of distinct elements of $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ to $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ satisfying

- $f(x, y) = f(y, x)$ for all $x \neq y$;

- $f(xg, yg) = f(x, y)^g$ for all $x \neq y$ and all g.

Because of the second property, it suffices to define $f(1, y)$ for $y \neq 1$ arbitrarily subject to the condition $f(1, x^{-1}) = f(1, x)^{x^{-1}}$. Note that this condition requires $f(1, s)^s = f(1, s)$ whenever s is an involution; this is possible, since any involution has a fixed point (as m is odd). Then we extend to all pairs by defining $f(x, y) = f(1, yx^{-1})^x$. We need to check that both properties are satisfied, and so no conflict arises.

Now we take a countable set of vertices, and let $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ act semiregularly on it, that is take the vertex set to be the union of countably many copies of $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ with $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ acting by right-multiplication on each copy. Each orbit is naturally identified with $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$; we let x_i denote the element identified with $x \in \mathrm{Sym}(m)$ in the ith orbit, as $i \in \mathbb{N}$ (where orbits are indexed by natural numbers). Then we colour the edges within each orbit (a copy of $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$) by giving $\{x_i, y_i\}$ the colour $f(x, y)$. The second of the conditions above, the translation condition, ensures that we get the right colouring under $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$-action on pairs. Now assume that colours within orbits i and j (each being a copy of $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$) are given. For edges between orbits i and j, with $i < j$, we colour $\{x_i, 1_j\}$ randomly, and then give $\{y_i, z_j\}$ the image of the colour of $\{(yz^{-1})_i, 1_j\}$ under z, that is act by translation on vertices and by permutation on colours.

Clearly the group $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ permutes the colours of the edges consistently, and in the same way as it permutes $\{1, \ldots, m\}$.

Next we show that a residual set of the coloured graphs we obtain are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$. We have to show that, given m finite disjoint sets of vertices, say $U_1, \ldots, U_m$, the set of graphs containing a vertex v joined by edges of colour i to all vertices in U_i (for $i = 1, \ldots, m$) is open and dense. The openness is clear. To see that it is dense, note that the m finite sets are contained in the union of a finite number of orbits (say those with index less than N); then, for any $i \geq N$, we are free to choose the colours of the edges joining these vertices to 1_i arbitrarily.

Now by construction, the group $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ we have constructed meets $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ in the identity; so it is the required complement.

How close can we get when m is even? The construction in the second part shows that, if there is a group G which acts as $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ on the set $\{1, \ldots, m\}$, in such a way that all involutions in G have fixed points on $\{1, \ldots, m\}$, then G is a supplement for $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ in $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ (that is, $G.\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) = \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$), and $G \cap \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is the kernel of the action of G on $\{1, \ldots, m\}$.

In the case that m is even but not divisible by 8, we will see that $\exists H \leq \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ which is a *supplement* such that $|\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \cap H| = 2$.

As the index is 2, H is a double cover of $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$. In this double cover of $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$, the fixed-point-free involutions lift to elements of order 4. So we can just repeat the previous proof using a double cover in which fixed-point-free involutions lits to elements of order 4.

There are two double covers of $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ for $n \geq 4$, described in [**289**, Chapter 2] and called there $\tilde{S}_m$ and $\hat{S}_m$. In $\tilde{S}_m$, the product of r disjoint transpositions lifts to an element of order 4 if and only if $r \equiv 1$ or 2 mod 4, while in $\hat{S}_m$, the condition is that $r \equiv 2$ or 3 mod 4. (This is a fairly simple calculation. The element $(t_1 t_3 ... t_{2r-1})^2 \in \tilde{S}_n$ can be calculated: each time we jump one t over another we get a factor z, and each t^2 gives a factor z, so altogether we have $z^{r(r+1)/2}$; this is equal to z if r is congruent to 1 or 2 mod 4. In $\hat{S}_n$, the calculation is similar with s in place of t, but $t^2 = 1$, so $(s_1 s_3 ... s_{2r-1})^2$ is $z^{r(r-1)/2}$, which is equal to z if r is congruent to 2 or 3 mod 4. So only the case $r = 0$ mod 4 is not covered. Now we have $m = 2r$ (since we want a fixed-point-free involution), so only the case $m = 0$ mod 8 is not covered.) This shows that there is a supplement meeting $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ in a group of order 2 for m even but not divisible by 8.

What happens in the remaining case, when m is a multiple of 8? Is there a finite group G with an epimorphism to $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ such that the inverse image of a fixed-point-free involution is not an involution? In other words, is there a finite supplement, and what is the smallest such? This would be true only up to conjugacy as different colourings between different orbits i and j above give different conjugacy classes.

1.3. Proof of Theorem 7.2. Since $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is primitive and not regular, its centralizer in the symmetric group is trivial; therefore $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ acts faithfully on $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ by conjugation. We have to show that there are no further automorphisms.

A permutation group G of countable degree is said to have the *small index property* if any subgroup H satisfying $|G : H| < 2^{\aleph_0}$ contains the pointwise stabilizer of a finite set; it has the *strong small index property* if any subgroup H satisfying $|G : H| < 2^{\aleph_0}$ lies between the pointwise and setwise stabilizer of a finite set.

Step 1 $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ has the strong small index property.

This is proved by a simple modification of the arguments for the case $m = 2$. The small index property was proved by Hodges *et al.* [**287**], using a result of Hrushovski [**292**]; the strong version was a simple extension due to Cameron [**113**].

Hrushovski showed that any finite graph X can be embedded into a finite graph Z such that all isomorphisms between subgraphs of X

extend to automorphisms of Z. Moreover, the graph Z is vertex-, edge- and nonedge-transitive. He uses this to construct a generic countable sequence of automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$. To extend this to $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ is comparatively straightforward. It is necessary to work with $(m-1)$-edge-coloured graphs (regarding the mth colour as 'transparent'). Now the arguments of Hodges *et al.* and Cameron go through essentially unchanged.

Step 2 Since $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ acts primitively on the vertex set, with permutation rank $m+1$, the vertex stabilizers are maximal subgroups of countable index with $m+1$ double cosets (orbits on ordered pairs corresponding to equality and the m edge colours). Moreover, any further subgroup of countable index has more than $m+1$ double cosets.

For let H be a maximal subgroup of countable index. By the strong SIP, H is the stabilizer of a k-set X. If g maps X to a disjoint k-set, then HgH determines the colours of the edges between X and X^g, up to permutations of these two sets. By universality, there are at least $m^{k^2}/(k!)^2$ such double cosets. Now it is not hard to prove that $m^{k^2}/(k!)^2 > m$ for $k \geq 2$. Hence we must have $k = 1$. (The number of double cosets cannot be changed by an automorphism, as the number $m+1$ is minimal).

Step 3 It follows that any automorphism permutes the vertex stabilizers among themselves, so is induced by a permutation of the vertices which normalises $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$. To finish the proof, we show that the normaliser of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ in the symmetric group is $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$.

This is straightforward. A vertex permutation which normalises $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ must permute among themselves the $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$-orbits on pairs of vertices, that is, the colour classes; so it belongs to $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$.

2. Introducing Some Groups

In this section we will introduce some new groups related to automorphism groups for random graphs.

First we borrow some concepts from [**13**], outlining their theory for a general countably infinite set Ω, before we include any graph structure. The set of *near-bijections* of Ω is given by

$$\mathrm{NB}(\Omega) = \{f : f \text{ is a bijection } \Omega_1 \to \Omega_2 \text{ between cofinite subsets of } \Omega\}.$$

Regarded as sets we have that $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega) \subseteq \mathrm{NB}(\Omega)$. The set $\mathrm{NS}(\Omega)$ of *near symmetries* is the set of equivalence classes of the equivalence relation $\equiv$ on $\mathrm{NB}(\Omega)$ where for bijections f_1, f_2, $f_1 \equiv f_2$ if there is a cofinite $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$ with $f_1|_{\Omega'} = f_2|_{\Omega'}$. This set forms a group, where the composition law is induced by the composition of maps. Composition $\circ$

of maps is well-defined, being independent of the choices made, and this induces a well-defined operation on equivalence classes by cofiniteness of operand sets. For $(f_1 \circ f_2)(x)$ is defined if and only if both $x \in \mathrm{dom}(f_2)$ and $f_2(x) \in \mathrm{dom}(f_1)$. Now the intersection of the two cofinite sets given by $\mathrm{dom}(f_1 \circ f_2) = f_2^{-1}(\mathrm{dom}(f_1) \cap \mathrm{range}(f_2))$ and $\mathrm{range}(f_1 \circ f_2)$ is cofinite. Finally it is easy to see that $f_1 \equiv f_1', f_2 \equiv f_2' \Leftrightarrow f_1 \circ f_2 \equiv f_1' \circ f_2'$.

The sequence

$$\mathrm{FSym}(\Omega) \to \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega) \to \mathrm{NS}(\Omega)$$

where the second map is a group homomorphism with kernel $\mathrm{FSym}(\Omega)$ is exact, so $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)/\mathrm{FSym}(\Omega) \leq \mathrm{NS}(\Omega)$ and the elements of this quotient are the equivalence classes of permutations. For $f \in \mathrm{NB}(\Omega)$ with Ω_1, Ω_2 cofinite subsets of Ω, define the *index* of f to be

$$\mathrm{ind}\, f = |\Omega - \Omega_2| - |\Omega - \Omega_1|.$$

7.3. Lemma (Alperin, Covington and Macpherson). *The map* $\mathrm{ind} : \mathrm{NB}(\Omega) \to \mathbb{Z}$ *induces a mapping* $\mathrm{ind} : \mathrm{NS}(\Omega) \to \mathbb{Z}$ *which is a homomorphism onto* $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$ *with kernel* $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)/\mathrm{FSym}(\Omega)$.

From this lemma, which is proved in [**13**], it follows that

$$1 \to \mathrm{FSym}(\Omega) \to \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega) \to \mathrm{NS}(\Omega) \to \mathbb{Z} \to 1.$$

Next we apply the above formalism to random graphs, firstly concentrating on the two-colour case. Define a *near-automorphism* of $\mathfrak{R}$ to be an element of $\mathrm{NB}(\mathfrak{R})$ which is an isomorphism from its domain to its range; denote the set of such maps by $\mathrm{NA}(\mathfrak{R})$. It is clear that a near-automorphism of $\mathfrak{R}$ has only finitely many extensions to a maximal (with respect to inclusion) near-automorphism of $\mathfrak{R}$. Let $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$ be the set of equivalence classes of elements of $\mathrm{NA}(\mathfrak{R})$ with the same equivalence relation as before. The elements of $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$ form a group with composition being composition of maps. Notice that $\mathrm{NA}(\mathfrak{R})$ is not a permutation group on $\mathfrak{R}$, and that a maximal near-automorphism is an automorphism if and only if it is a permutation, both necessary and sufficient conditions following by definition.

Let $\mathfrak{R}'$ be $\mathfrak{R}$ with edge $\{x, y\}$ deleted. Then $\mathfrak{R}' \cong \mathfrak{R}$. Let the isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{R}' \to \mathfrak{R}$ be such that $f : x \to u$, $f : y \to v$, $x \sim y, u \not\sim v$, and otherwise f is an automorphism. So $f \in \mathrm{NA}(\mathfrak{R})$ is a permutation, and it will also be an element of $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$. Therefore $f \in \mathrm{NA}(\mathfrak{R})$ is contained in both a permutation and in two maximal near-automorphisms (in one $\{u, v\}$ is an edge and in the other it is a non-edge), but $f \notin \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

Consider Figure 2 where the uppermost exact sequence for Ω instead of $\mathfrak{R}$ is taken from [**13**].



FIGURE 2. The new groups $\mathrm{NS}(\mathfrak{R})$ and $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$ and their subgroup inclusions.

Choose $f \in \mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$. There is a finite set S of edges and non-edges changed by the isomorphism

$$f : \mathfrak{R}\backslash\{\text{vertices in } S\} \to \mathfrak{R}\backslash\{\text{vertices in } f(S)\}.$$

So $f \in \mathrm{NA}(\mathfrak{R})$. Now $\phi' : f \to [f]$. Notice $\phi'(\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})) \subset \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap Im(\theta) = \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap \ker(\,\mathrm{ind}(\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})))$. This inclusion is strict because not all isomorphisms $\mathfrak{R}\backslash\{x\} \to \mathfrak{R}\backslash\{y\}$, where x and y are vertices of $\mathfrak{R}$ and both domain and codomain are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$, extend to near automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$, but only those which map the vertices attached to x to the vertices attached to y, apart from a finite number; only for these will the one-point extension property be valid. For example if some of the adjacencies at x are changed randomly then with probability 1, the resulting graph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$. Similarly a switching at x which interchanges all edges and non-edges at x still gives a graph isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$.

Denote an equivalence class of near-automorphisms h in $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$ by $e = [h]_{NE}$. Let $\phi : \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}) \to \mathrm{NS}(\mathfrak{R}) : e \mapsto \phi(e) = [h]_{NS}$ be a map which we will prove is a monomorphism. That ϕ is well-defined, meaning that $[h]_{NE} = [h']_{NE} \Rightarrow [h]_{NS} = [h']_{NS}$ follows from the definitions of $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$ and $\mathrm{NS}(\mathfrak{R})$ and that the equivalence class is the same in these groups, that is the same cofinite operand for both groups.

Furthermore, if $e_1, e_2 \in \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$ and $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3$ are cofinite subsets of the vertex set of $\mathfrak{R}$ chosen as in Figure 3, then

$\phi(e_1e_2) = \phi([h_1]^1_{NE}[h_2]^2_{NE}) = \phi([h_1]^3_{NE}[h_2]^3_{NE}) = \phi([h_3]^3_{NE}) = [h_3]^3_{NS} = [h_1]^3_{NS}[h_2]^3_{NS} = \phi(e_1)\phi(e_2)$,

where the superscript on $[h]$ indexes the equivalence class so that for

example $[h_1]^3_{NE} = e_{1|\Omega_3}$ and $\Omega_3 = \Omega_1 \cap e_1^{-1}(\Omega_2 \cap e_1(\Omega_1))$ (see Figure 3). The homomorphism is clearly injective because $\ker(\phi) = 1$. Whence

7.4. Proposition. *The map $\phi : \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{NS}(\mathfrak{R})$ is a monomorphism.*



Figure 3. Determination of Ω_3

How does the map $\theta : \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R}) \to \mathrm{NS}(\mathfrak{R})$ behave when it is restricted to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$? The random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ has no non-trivial finitary automorphisms, because a map from vertex x to vertex y moves an infinity of vertices attached to x to those attached to y. As $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap \mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}) = 1$, the map $\theta_{|\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})}$ is a monomorphism into $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$. However $\theta(\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}))$ is not normal in $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$ because as we will show below there is a monomorphism from $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ to $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$, so that $\theta(\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})) \lhd \theta(\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}))$, which because θ is a homomorphism would give $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}) \lhd \mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$, a contradiction because $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is highly transitive (see Appendix 8), and so any non-trivial normal subgroup must also be highly transitive, which $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is not.

Also $\phi'(\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}))$ is not normal in $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$ as can be seen from the following example. Consider a vertex triple $\{x, y, z\} \in V(\mathfrak{R})$ with $x \sim y$, $x \sim z$, $y \not\sim z$. Take $a \in \mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ mapping $x \sim y$ to $xa \not\sim ya$ and otherwise preserving all adjacencies, and also $e \in \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}) \backslash \phi'(\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}))$ that moves vertex y. We can choose e to include the transposition (y, z). Then the effect of $e^{-1}ae$ acting on vertices $\{x, y, z\}$ is: $\{x \sim y\} \mapsto \{x \sim y\}$, $\{x \sim z\} \mapsto \{x \not\sim z\}$, $\{y \not\sim z\} \mapsto \{y \not\sim z\}$. Since $e \notin \mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$, in moving y it moves an infinite number of its neighbours. So there are an infinite number of vertices z whose adjacency with x are changed by e. Therefore $e^{-1}ae$ changes infinitely many edges on x. So $e^{-1}ae \notin \mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

Define the *vertex index* $N(g)$ of an element g of an acting group to be the number of vertices v such that infinitely many adjacencies are changed at v by g. This index has a norm-like property $N(g_1 g_2) \leq N(g_1) + N(g_2)$ and also $N(g^{-1}) = N(g)$. We can then define two new groups

$$\mathrm{Aut}_0 = \langle g : N(g) = 0 \rangle$$

$$\mathrm{Aut}_{fin} = \langle g : N(g) < \infty \rangle.$$

The *zero vertex index group* Aut_0 is the group that changes infinitely many edges at no vertices, and the *finite vertex index group* Aut_{fin} is the group that changes infinitely many edges at finitely many vertices.

From the definitions, $\mathrm{Aut}_0 \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}$.

It is clear that $\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}) \lhd \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}$. Recall that $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$ is the set of equivalence classes of bijections on the cofinite subsets of the vertex set which are isomorphisms from their domain to their range; its elements form a group by composition of maps.

Just as we were able to define an index map above, we can define another mapping $\mathrm{ind}' : \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}) \to \mathbb{Z} : [w] \mapsto z$ or alternatively $\mathrm{ind}'\, f' = |\Omega - \mathrm{range}(f')| - |\Omega - \mathrm{dom}(f')|$ where f' is a bijection between cofinite subsets of the vertex set Ω. As before, this mapping is a homomorphism onto $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$ with kernel $\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R})$. The kernel $\ker(\mathrm{ind}')$ consists of all bijections such that $|\Omega - \mathrm{range}(f')| = |\Omega - \mathrm{dom}(f')|$. The mapping $\tilde{\phi} : \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}) \to \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$ is a group monomorphism because for $w \in \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$, $\tilde{\phi}(w)$ is an automorphism on all but a finite vertex subset, and this subset can be chosen to lie outside the domain and range of some $a \in \mathrm{NA}(\mathfrak{R})$ and so of $[a] \in \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$. From the equality $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})/\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}) = \ker(\mathrm{ind}')$ it follows that

$$\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})/\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}) \lhd \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}).$$

What else can we say about the quotient $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})/\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R})$? It is clearly not maximal in $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$, because its quotient in this overgroup is $\mathbb{Z}$ which has one subgroup generated by each element. By connectedness of the random graphs, the action of $\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R})$ will always change the adjacencies on an infinite number of edges, so $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap \mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}) = \{1\}$. However $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ and $\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R})$ are not sufficient to generate $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$, because their elements only ever act on finite vertex sets. We can state this more formally as a proposition, for which we need the following claim.

7.5. Claim. *For a vertex $v \in \mathfrak{R}$ let $N(v), \overline{N}(v)$ be its neighbours and non-neighbours. There exists an automorphism g of $\mathfrak{R}\backslash\{v\}$ which interchanges the sets $N(v)$ and $\overline{N}(v)$.*

Proof. This is quite clear from elementary random graph properties. Starting with two empty sets of vertices, build in parallel, two countably infinite graphs, which are isomorphic to $N(v) \cong \overline{N}(v)$. By a further application of the 1-point extension property, attach vertex v to $N(v)$, then extend to construct the whole graph $\mathfrak{R}$. (Alternatively, two infinite cliques such as $N(v)$ and $\overline{N}(v)$ exist as subgraphs of $\mathfrak{R}$ by its universality). Then the required g exists by homogeneity of $\mathfrak{R}$. □

Then,

7.6. Proposition. $\langle \mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R})), \mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}))\rangle \neq \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$.

Proof. Suppose that $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ as in the claim, and that $g_1 \in \mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}), g_2 \in \mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$. Let $S(g)$ denote the set of vertices v such that infinitely many adjacencies at v are changed by g. Then $|S(g)| = 1$ and $S(g_2) = \varnothing$. Also if $g_1 \neq 1$ then $|S(g)| \geq 2$, where $S(g_1)$ denotes the support of g_1. Finally $S(g_1 g_2) = S(g_1)$. □

We pose an open question. Is $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})/\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R})$ simple?

The above considerations generalize to $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$, as shown in Figure 4. In this diagram, it is intended that each type of group appertaining to the m-coloured random graph is embedded in the corresponding $(m-1)$-coloured group. So there are in fact $(m-1)$ layers of groups for m colours. We remark on some obvious embeddings:

(i) The group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m-1,\omega})$. The simplicity of all the automorphism groups was proved in [**527**].
(ii) The groups in the inclusion $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m-1,\omega}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ were studied in [**529**].

(iii) $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{m}\,\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})_{\mathfrak{m}} \cong \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m-1,\omega})$.

Here $\mathfrak{m}\,\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ denotes the automorphism group acting on $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ in which colours $\mathfrak{m}$ and $\mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{1}$ can be interchanged, and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})_{\mathfrak{m}}$ means the automorphism group acting on that m-coloured graph which is colourblind in colours $\mathfrak{m}$ and $\mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{1}$, that is does not distinguish between these two colours.

By defining a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-valued parity map from $\mathfrak{m}\,\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, according to the parity of the interchange of $\mathfrak{m}$ and $\mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{1}$, we can see that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \lhd \mathfrak{m}\,\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$. However we claim that the image of the group embedding $\mathfrak{m}\,\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ into $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is not normal in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})_{\mathfrak{m}}$. For take a vertex triple $\{x,y,z\} \in V(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, and choose $a \in \mathfrak{m}\,\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ so as to stabilize $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ apart from a colour transposition $\mathfrak{m} \mapsto \mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{1}$ on edge $\{x,y\}$, and take $b \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})_{\mathfrak{m}}$ to include the (y,z) transposition. Then $b^{-1}ab$ acting on the vertex triple stabilizes the colour on edge $\{x \sim y\}$ as $\mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{1}$ and transposes the colour on edge $\{x \sim z\}$ from $\mathfrak{m}$ to $\mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{1}$. So $b^{-1}ab \notin \mathfrak{m}\,\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, which proves the claim.

(iv) All of the groups $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ and $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ follow the same embedding pattern with respect to m as that of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ in (i) above.

The following series of embeddings require further study:

(a) $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}_{m-1,\omega}) \hookrightarrow \ldots \mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$.

(b) $\mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R}_{m-1,\omega}) \hookrightarrow \ldots \mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R})$.

(c) $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}_{m-1,\omega}) \hookrightarrow \ldots \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$.

(v) That $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$ is highly transitive follows either from the fact that it contains $\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R})$ or from it being an overgroup of $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ which is itself highly transitive.

(vi) For $m \geq 2$, consider the epimorphisms:

$$\phi_m : \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) \to \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})/\,\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}).$$

Given that $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ acts as an automorphism-like group and because all of the finitary groups in the following series are equal, we have that

$$\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})/\,\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}) < \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}_{m-1,\omega})/\,\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}_{m-1,\omega}) < \ldots < \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})/\,\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}).$$



FIGURE 4. The new groups $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, $\mathrm{NS}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, Aut_{fin}, Aut_0 and their subgroup inclusions: variations on the theme of automorphism groups.

CHAPTER 8

Filters, Topologies and Groups from $\mathfrak{R}$

Once the concept of infinity has been taken seriously, a human dwelling can no longer be made of the universe. The universe can still be thought but it can no longer be imaged; the man who thinks it no longer really lives in it.

Martin Buber

The role of relational structures (graphs, directed graphs, partial orders, etc.) in the investigation of permutation groups is well-known. Of course, the automorphism group of a non-trivial relational structure cannot be highly transitive; if a group is highly transitive, we would expect to have to use "infinitary" structures such as filters and topologies in its study. In fact, the gap is not so large. For example, Macpherson and Praeger [**377**] showed that a permutation group of countable degree which is not highly transitive is contained in a maximal subgroup of the symmetric group. As a reviewer of the paper said, "Somewhat surprisingly, the proof is not entirely combinatorial, but also involves a little model theory, in particular, an appeal to the Cherlin–Mills–Zil'ber theorem on $\aleph_0$-categorical strictly minimal sets." The other ingredients are filters and topologies, and indeed their main task is to show that such a group preserves a non-trivial filter; they deduce this from the fact that it preserves a non-trivial topology. (A more elementary proof of part of this theorem, avoiding the model theory, was given in [**111**].)

The purpose of this chapter is to carry further the investigation of topologies and filters derived from relational structures, and their automorphism groups. We give a flavour of some of the ideas that arise when filters are considered on random graph vertex sets rather than on structureless sets, for example what types of filters of random graph vertex subsets admit some of the groups that we have identified in the previous chapter.

1. The Random Graph and its Relations

We will study a filter and a topology defined naturally from $\mathfrak{R}$, generated by the vertex neighbourhoods in $\mathfrak{R}$, whose automorphism groups contain the automorphism group of $\mathfrak{R}$. For such neighbourhood filters, $\mathfrak{R}$ has a 'universal' property: any countable graph whose neighbourhood filter is non-trivial contains $\mathfrak{R}$ as a spanning subgraph. From the injection property of $\mathfrak{R}$ it follows that any finite vertex set of $\mathfrak{R}$ has a common neighbour, and this property characterizes the class of countable graphs containing $\mathfrak{R}$ as a spanning subgraph; see the appendix to the chapter for a proof of this property of $\mathfrak{R}$. The neighbourhood topology is T_1 but not Hausdorff, but appears to have some interesting properties, somewhat reminiscent of those of $\mathbb{Q}$. We will also use the *random bipartite graph* $\mathfrak{B}$, the unique graph with the property that, given a bipartition of a countable set into two countable parts, if edges between sets of the bipartition are chosen independently with probability 1, then the resulting graph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{B}$ with probability 1.

Recall that S. Thomas [**518**] found all reducts of $\mathfrak{R}$: that is, all closed subgroups of the symmetric group on the vertex set $V(\mathfrak{R})$ of $\mathfrak{R}$ which contain the automorphism group of $\mathfrak{R}$. We will refer to his result later. By contrast, the automorphism groups of the filter and topology defined here are not reducts; they are highly transitive, so their closures are the symmetric group $\mathrm{Sym}(V(\mathfrak{R}))$.

2. Neighbourhood Filters

A *filter* on a set is a family $\mathscr{F}$ of subsets of $V(\mathfrak{R})$ satisfying

- $X, Y \in \mathscr{F}$ implies $X \cap Y \in \mathscr{F}$;
- $X \in \mathscr{F}$, $Y \supseteq X$ implies $Y \in \mathscr{F}$.

A filter $\mathscr{F}$ is *trivial* if it consists of all subsets of $V(\mathfrak{R})$; it is *principal* if it consists of all sets containing a fixed subset A of $\mathscr{F}$; and it is an *ultrafilter* if, for any $X \subseteq V(\mathfrak{R})$, just one of X and $V(\mathfrak{R}) \setminus X$ belongs to $\mathscr{F}$. Ultrafilters are just maximal non-trivial filters; the axiom of choice implies that every non-trivial filter is contained in an ultrafilter.

Given a family $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of $V(\mathfrak{R})$, the *filter generated by* $\mathcal{A}$ is the set

$$\mathscr{F} = \{X \subseteq V : (\exists A_1, \ldots, A_n \in \mathcal{A})(A_1 \cap \cdots \cap A_n) \subseteq X\}.$$

Two families $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ generate the same filter if and only if each member in $\mathcal{A}_2$ lies in the filter generated by $\mathcal{A}_1$ (that is, contains a finite intersection of sets of $\mathcal{A}_1$) and *vice versa*.

If $\mathscr{F}$ is a filter, then $\mathscr{F} \cup \{\varnothing\}$ is a topology. Since $V(\mathfrak{R})$ is countable, no non-discrete metric on $V(\mathfrak{R})$ can be complete. If the topology is not discrete then the set of complements of finite unions of discrete sets is a filter.

In this chapter we will assume that the set Ω is countably infinite. We claim that every nonprincipal ultrafilter $\mathscr{F}$ contains all cofinite sets in Ω. For a contradiction assume that A is cofinite and $A \notin \mathscr{F}$ then $B = \Omega \setminus A \in \mathscr{F}$ and B is finite. Choose $B_0 \subseteq B$ minimal with respect to lying in $\mathscr{F}$ then $B_0 \subseteq X$, $\forall X \in \mathscr{F}$. Suppose $|B_0| > 1$. Then $B_0 \setminus \{x\} \notin \mathscr{F}$. So $(\Omega \setminus \{B_0\}) \cup \{x\} \in \mathscr{F}$. So $B_0 \cap (\Omega \setminus \{B_0\} \cup \{x\}) = \{x\} \in \mathscr{F}$. So $\mathscr{F}$ is principal, and the claim is proved.

The filter of all cofinite subsets [**111**] is called the *Fréchet filter* [**307**] over an infinite set. It is non-principal, and any ultrafilter that extends a Fréchet filter is also non-principal.

As an example of a filter supporting a specific group action, we show that if $\mathscr{F}$ is a nonprincipal ultrafilter then it admits $\mathrm{FSym}(\Omega)$. Let $\mathscr{F}$ be such a filter. If $A \in \mathscr{F}$ and $g \in \mathrm{FSym}(\Omega)$ then $|A \setminus A^g| < \omega$. So $A \cap A^g$ is a cofinite subset of A, and we can write this as $A \cap B$ for some cofinite set B. So $B \in \mathscr{F}$, so $A \cap B \in \mathscr{F}$ so $A^g \in \mathscr{F}$.

Let Γ be a graph on a countable vertex set V. We define the *neighbourhood filter* $\mathscr{F}_\Gamma$ *of* Γ to be the filter generated by $\{\Gamma(v) : v \in V\}$, where $\Gamma(v)$ denotes the neighbourhood of v in Γ, the set of vertices adjacent to v.

8.1. Proposition. *Suppose that* Γ *has the property that each vertex has a non-neighbour. Then the filter generated by the closed neighbourhoods* $\overline{\Gamma}(v) = \Gamma(v) \cup \{v\}$ *is equal to* $\mathscr{F}_\Gamma$.

Proof. For we have $\Gamma(v) \subseteq \overline{\Gamma}(v)$, and, if w is not adjacent to v, then $\overline{\Gamma}(v) \cap \overline{\Gamma}(w) \subseteq \Gamma(v)$. □

The condition on Γ is necessary. If Γ is the complete graph, the closed neighbourhoods generate the filter on $\{V\}$, while the open neighbourhoods generate the Fréchet filter of cofinite subsets of V.

Let $\mathfrak{R}$ denote the countable random graph.

8.2. Proposition. *The following three conditions on a graph* Γ *are equivalent:*

(a) $\mathscr{F}_\Gamma$ *is nontrivial;*
(b) Γ *contains* $\mathfrak{R}$ *as a spanning subgraph;*
(c) $\mathscr{F}_\Gamma \subseteq \mathscr{F}_\mathfrak{R}$.

Proof. A filter is trivial if and only if it contains the empty set. So $\mathscr{F}_\Gamma$ is non-trivial if and only if any finite number of neighbourhoods

have non-empty intersection. This is equivalent to the statement that $\mathfrak{R}$ is a spanning subgraph of Γ; see the appendix to this chapter.

So (a) and (b) are equivalent.

If Γ contains $\mathfrak{R}$ as a spanning subgraph, then $\mathfrak{R}(v) \subseteq \Gamma(v)$ for all v. So (b) implies (c). Conversely, $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}$ is non-trivial (by our proof that (b) implies (a)), so (c) implies (a). □

Remarks This result shows that $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}$ is the unique maximal neighbourhood filter. But this uniqueness is only up to isomorphism. So part (c) really means that $\mathscr{F}_{\Gamma}$ is contained in a filter isomorphic to $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}$.

For example, it is possible to find two filters isomorphic to $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}$, one contained in the other. For let T be the random 3-colouring of the edges of the complete graph, with colours red, green and blue. Let $\mathfrak{R}_1$ be the graph consisting of red edges, and $\mathfrak{R}_2$ the graph consisting of red and green edges, in T. Then both $\mathfrak{R}_1$ and $\mathfrak{R}_2$ are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$. Since $\mathfrak{R}_1(v) \subseteq \mathfrak{R}_2(v)$, we have $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}_2} \subseteq \mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}$. We show that the inequality is strict.

The set $\mathfrak{R}_1(v)$ belongs to $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}_1}$. Suppose that it belongs to $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}_2}$. Then there are vertices $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ such that

$$\mathfrak{R}_2(w_1) \cap \ldots \cap \mathfrak{R}_2(w_n) \subseteq \mathfrak{R}_1(v).$$

But, since the green graph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$, there is a vertex x joined to all of $v, w_1, \ldots, w_n$ by green edges; then x belongs to the left-hand expression of the displayed inclusion but not to $\mathfrak{R}_1(v)$, a contradiction.

Similarly it can be shown that there are countable chains of filters isomorphic to $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}$.

3. Automorphism Groups of Neighbourhood Filters

Clearly $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$. We will see in this section that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$ is much larger than $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

For convenience let us recall the definition of a few groups. We say that a permutation g changes the adjacency of v and w if $(v \sim w) \Leftrightarrow (v^g \not\sim w^g)$. We say that g changes finitely many adjacencies at v if there are only finitely many points w for which g changes the adjacency of v and w.

Let $C(g)$ be the set of pairs $\{v, w\}$ whose adjacency is changed by g. Then $C(g^{-1}) = C(g)^{g^{-1}}$ and $C(gh) \subseteq C(g) \cup C(h)^{g^{-1}}$.

- $\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is the group of anti-automorphisms and automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$;
- $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is the group of switching-automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$;
- $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is the group of permutations which change only finitely many adjacencies, (*almost-automorphisms*);

- $\mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R})$ is the group of permutations changing only finitely many adjacencies at any vertex (see Chapter 7);
- $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$ is the group of permutations which change infinitely many adjacencies at only finitely many vertices (see Chapter 7);
- $\mathrm{FSym}(V)$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(V)$ are the finitary symmetric group and the full symmetric group on the set V.

By inspection, all these sets of permutations can truly be seen to form groups, as claimed. (For $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$, $\mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R})$ and $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$, use the above facts about $C(g)$). The groups $\mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R})$, $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$ are not closed. They are all highly transitive, so their closures are $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R})$.

8.3. Proposition.
(a) $\mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R}) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$;
(b) $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}) \not\leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$ *and* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}) \not\leq \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$;
(c) $\mathrm{FSym}(V) \leq \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$, *and* $\mathrm{FSym}(V) \cap \mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R}) = \{1\}$.
(d) $\mathrm{FSym}(V) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$.

Proof. (a) Let $g \in \mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R})$. It suffices to show that, for any vertex v, we have $\mathfrak{R}(v)^g \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}$. Now by assumption, $\mathfrak{R}(v)^g$ differs only finitely from $\mathfrak{R}(v^g)$; let $\mathfrak{R}(v)^g \setminus \mathfrak{R}(v^g) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$. Then we have

$$\mathfrak{R}(v^g) \cap \mathfrak{R}(x_1) \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{R}(x_n) \subseteq \mathfrak{R}(v)^g,$$

and we are done.

(b) Choose a vertex v, and consider the graph $\mathfrak{R}'$ obtained by changing all adjacencies at v. Then $\mathfrak{R}' \cong \mathfrak{R}$. Choose an isomorphism g from $\mathfrak{R}$ to $\mathfrak{R}'$; since $\mathfrak{R}'$ is vertex-transitive, we can assume that g fixes v. So g maps $\mathfrak{R}(v)$ to $\mathfrak{R}_1(v) = V(\mathfrak{R}) \setminus (\{v\} \cup \mathfrak{R}(v))$. Clearly $g \in \mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$, since it changes only one adjacency at any point different from v. But if $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$, then we would have $\mathfrak{R}_1(v) \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}$, a contradiction since $\mathfrak{R}(v) \cap \mathfrak{R}_1(v) = \varnothing$.

In the reverse direction, let $\mathfrak{R}''$ be the graph obtained by changing all adjacencies between non-neighbours of v. Again $\mathfrak{R}'' \cong \mathfrak{R}$, and we can pick an isomorphism from $\mathfrak{R}$ to $\mathfrak{R}''$ which fixes v. Now g changes infinitely many adjacencies at all non-neighbours of v (and none at v or its neighbours). Also, if w is a non-neighbour of v, then $\mathfrak{R}(v) \cap \mathfrak{R}(w)^g = \mathfrak{R}(v) \cap \mathfrak{R}(w^g)$, and so $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$.

(c) Any non-identity finitary permutation belongs to $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}) \setminus \mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R})$. For if g moves v, then g changes infinitely many adjacencies at v (namely, all v and w, where w is adjacent to v but not v^g and is not in the support of g). On the other hand, if g fixes v, then v changes

the adjacency of v and w only if g moves w, and there are only finitely many such w.

(d) If g is a finitary permutation, then $\mathfrak{R}(v)^g$ contains a cofinite subset of $\mathfrak{R}(v)$, which clearly contains an element of $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}$. □

Note that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$ is not equal to either $\mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R})$ or $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R})$.

The graph $\mathfrak{R}'$ in the proof of Proposition 8.3(b) is obtained from $\mathfrak{R}$ by switching with respect to the set $\{v\}$; so the permutation g belongs to $S(\mathfrak{R})$. Thus $S(\mathfrak{R}) \not\leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$. In fact, more is true:

8.4. Proposition. $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}) \cap \mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R}) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}) \cap \mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

Proof. Any anti-automorphism g of $\mathfrak{R}$ maps $\mathfrak{R}(v)$ to a set disjoint from $\mathfrak{R}(v^g)$; so no anti-automorphism can belong to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$.

Suppose that $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$ is an isomorphism from $\mathfrak{R}$ to $\sigma_X(\mathfrak{R})$, where σ_X denotes switching with respect to X. We may suppose that σ_X is not the identity, that is, $X \neq \varnothing$ and $Y = V(\mathfrak{R}) \setminus X \neq \varnothing$. Choose x and y so that $x^g \in X$ and $y^g \in Y$. Then $\mathfrak{R}(x)^g \triangle Y = \mathfrak{R}(x^g)$ and $\mathfrak{R}(y)^g \triangle X = \mathfrak{R}(y^g)$. Hence $\mathfrak{R}(x^g) \cap \mathfrak{R}(x)^g \subseteq X$ and $\mathfrak{R}(y^g) \cap \mathfrak{R}(y^g) \subseteq Y$. Hence

$$\mathfrak{R}(x^g) \cap \mathfrak{R}(x)^g \cap \mathfrak{R}(y^g) \cap \mathfrak{R}(y)^g = \varnothing,$$

a contradiction. □

4. Fixed Points on Ultrafilters

Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a filter on Ω. Define $Aut(\mathscr{F})$ to be the group of automorphisms of $\mathscr{F}$ (permutations g of Ω such that g and g^{-1} map $\mathscr{F}$ to itself), and $B(\mathscr{F})$ the set of permutations g such that $\mathrm{fix}(g) \in \mathscr{F}$, where $\mathrm{fix}(g)$ is the set of fixed points of g.

8.5. Proposition. (a) *$B(\mathscr{F})$ is a normal subgroup of $Aut(\mathscr{F})$.*
(b) *If $\mathscr{F}$ is an ultrafilter then $B(\mathscr{F}) = Aut(\mathscr{F})$.*

Proof First we show that $B(\mathscr{F})$ is a group. Clearly it is closed under inversion. If $g_1, g_2 \in B(\mathscr{F})$, then $\mathrm{fix}(g_1), \mathrm{fix}(g_2) \in \mathscr{F}$, and $\mathrm{fix}(g_1 g_2) \supseteq \mathrm{fix}(g_1) \cap \mathrm{fix}(g_2)$.

Next we show that $B(\mathscr{F}) \subseteq Aut(\mathscr{F})$. Take $g \in B(\mathscr{F})$ and $Y \in \mathscr{F}$. Then $Yg \supseteq Y \cap \mathrm{fix}(g)$, so $Yg \in \mathscr{F}$.

Finally, suppose that $\mathscr{F}$ is an ultrafilter, and take $g \in Aut(\mathscr{F})$. Write $X = A \cup B \cup C \cup D$, where the four sets are chosen as follows. First, $A = \mathrm{fix}(g)$. Now, choose a point in each non-trivial cycle of g, and let B consist of alternate points of the cycle beginning at the chosen point. (If the cycle has odd length $2n+1$, then we put just n

points into B.) Then $C = Bg$, and D consists of the remaining points (one from each odd cycle of g). Now one of the sets A, B, C, D must belong to $\mathscr{F}$, since it is an ultrafilter. But $Bg = C$, $Cg \subseteq B \cup D$, and $Dg \subseteq B$; so none of B, C, D can belong to $\mathscr{F}$. Thus, $A \in \mathscr{F}$, showing that $g \in B(\mathscr{F})$, as required.

8.6. Corollary. *A necessary condition for a permutation group to fix an ultrafilter is that every element of the group has a fixed point.*

This condition is not sufficient. If K is an algebraically closed field, the group $\mathrm{PGL}(n, K)$, acting on the $(n-1)$-dimensional projective space, has the property that every group element fixes a point (since every matrix has an eigenvector). But some elements fix only one point, and clearly the group preserves no principal filter. Note that, if $K = \mathbb{C}$, the projective space is compact. Note also that the automorphism group of any non-principal ultrafilter contains the group of finitary permutations, and so is highly transitive. Also, such a group is a maximal subgroup of the full symmetric group.

5. Sierpiński's Theorem

The group $H(\mathbb{Q})$ of autohomeomorphisms of the rationals regarded as a topological group, is both highly transitive and contains no non-trivial finitary permutations [**415**]. Mekler *et al.* [**392**] proved that $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ cannot be embedded into $H(\mathbb{Q})$.

Truss proved [**528**] that the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ can be, and we outline his proof below. He used the following idea: a *permutation embedding* of a permutation group G_1 acting on a set Ω_1 into a permutation group G_2 acting on a set Ω_2 is a bijection from Ω_1 onto Ω_2 which induces a group monomorphism of G_1 into G_2.

Mekler gave [**391**] a necessary and sufficient condition for a countable permutation group to be embedded in $H(\mathbb{Q})$. The reformulation of his criterion by Пeter Neumann [**415**] is: if $g_1, \ldots, g_n$ are finitely many members of a group G, then $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{supp}(g_i)$ is empty or infinite. Certainly if $G \leq H(\mathbb{Q})$ then the support of any homeomorphism is an open set in $\mathbb{Q}$ and any open set is empty or infinite. Mekler's criterion, which is similar to Truss's Lemma A.27 in Appendix 8, implies that every countable subset of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ embeds in $H(\mathbb{Q})$. The group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is uncountable and Mekler's Theorem does not apply.

We will give Пeter Neumann's proof of Sierpiński's characterisation of $\mathbb{Q}$ [**415**], which we need in both the construction of the embedding which follows, and also in the next section. A different proof is given in Sierpiński's book [**491**, § 59].

We shall need some definitions. A space is *second countable* if there is a countable base for the topology; it is 0-*dimensional* if for any $x \in X$ and any open set U containing x there is a clopen set V such that $x \in V \subseteq U$; X is a T_1 *space* if singleton sets are closed, that is if $\{x\} = \bigcap\{U \mid x \in U \text{ and } U \text{ is closed in } X\}$ for any $x \in X$; an *isolated point* x is one for which the singleton set $\{x\}$ is open. The topological space X is metrizable.

8.7. THEOREM (Sierpiński's Theorem). *Let X be a second countable, 0-dimensional, T_1 topological space. Then X is homeomorphic with a subspace of $\mathbb{R}$. If moreover X is countable and has no isolated points then X is homeomorphic with $\mathbb{Q}$.*

PROOF. The space X has a countable family of subsets $C_1, C_2, \ldots$ such that

(1) each C_r is clopen;
(2) if $x \in X$ then $\{x\} = \bigcap\{C_r \mid x \in C_r\}$;
(3) the family is a base for the topology of X.

For a given $x \in X$ and family $\{C_r\}$, define

$$D_r(x) := \begin{cases} C_r & \text{if } x \in C_r \\ X - C_r & \text{if } x \notin C_r \end{cases}$$

and clopen sets containing x,

$$U_n(x) := \bigcap_{r=1}^{n} D_r(x).$$

An embedding of X into $\mathbb{R}$ is sought. Define the continuous map $f_r : X \to \{0, 2\}$ by

$$f_r(x) := \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } x \in C_r \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin C_r. \end{cases}$$

From (2), the function

$$f(x) := \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} f_r(x) \cdot 3^{-r}$$

is a Cantor set-valued 1–1 map of X into $\mathbb{R}$.

To show that f is continuous, let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $3^{-m} < \epsilon$ for all $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}$. If $x \in U_m(x_0)$ then for any $x_0 \in X$, $f_r(x) = f_r(x_0)$ whenever $1 \le r \le m$, so that

$$|f(x) - f(x_0)| \le \sum_{m+1}^{\infty} 2 \cdot 3^{-r} = 3^{-m} < \epsilon.$$

To show that $f^{-1} : f(X) \to X$ is continuous, for any $y_0 \in f(X)$ say $y_0 = f(x_0)$, let U be any open subset of X containing x_0. From (3), $\exists n$ such that $x_0 \in C_n \subseteq U$, so that $U_n(x_0) \subseteq U$. Define $\delta := 3^{-n}$. If $y \in f(X)$,

say $y = f(x)$ for $x \in X$, is such that $|y - y_0| < \delta$, and if m is the least natural number such that $f_m(x) \neq f_m(x_0)$ (assuming that $x \neq x_0$), then

$$|f(x) - f(x_0)| \geq 2 \cdot 3^{-m} - \sum_{m+1}^{\infty} 2 \cdot 3^{-r} = 3^{-m},$$

implying that $m > n$ and so $x \in U_n(x_0)$. So if $y \in f(X)$ and $|y - y_0| < \delta$ then $f^{-1}(y) \in U$ and so f^{-1} is continuous. This proves that f is a homeomorphism of X to a subset of the Cantor set.

Now further suppose that X is countable and has no isolated points. The next step is to verify that the family $\{C_r\}$ can further be chosen to satisfy

(4) $\forall x \in X \ \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq m, x \in C_{n+1}$ and $U_n(x) \nsubseteq C_{n+1}$;

(5) $\forall x \in X \ \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \exists n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq m, x \notin C_{n+1}$ and $U_n(x) \cap C_{n+1} \neq \varnothing$.

Let $V_1, V_2, V_3, \ldots$ be the countable base for the topology on X, and enumerate the set of all pairs (x, V_i) with $x \in V_i$ as $(x_1, X_1), (x_2, X_2), (x_3, X_3), \ldots$. Let $x_1 \in C_1 \subset X_1$ and $x_1 \notin C_2 \subset X_1$, where $C_2 \neq \varnothing$ and C_1, C_2 are clopen in X. Next suppose that $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_{2k-1}, C_{2k}$ have already been chosen. Then $U_{2k+1}(x_{k+1})$ is open, contains x_{k+1} and so contains $y \neq x_{k+1}$. By (1) and (2) we can take C_{2k+1} to be clopen in X_{k+1}, $x_{k+1} \in C_{2k+1}$, and $y \notin C_{2k+1}$. So $U_{2k}(X_{k+1}) \subseteq C_{2k+1}$. Now $\exists z \in U_{2k+1}(X_{k+1}) = U_{2k}(X_{k+1}) \cap C_{2k+1}$ where $z \neq x_{k+1}$. Take C_{2k+2} to be any clopen set containing z but not x_{k+1}.

The constructed sequence $\{C_i\}$ satisfies (1). Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\bigcap\{C_r |\ x \in C_r\} \\ \subseteq &\bigcap\{C_r |\ x \in C_r \text{ and } r \text{ is odd}\} \\ \subseteq &\bigcap\{X_s |\ x = x_s\} \\ \subseteq &\bigcap\{V_i |\ x \in V_i\} \\ = &\{x\} \end{aligned}$$

so (2) is satisfied. If U is any open set and $x \in U$ then there exists i such that $x \in V_i$ and $V_i \subseteq U$; then (x, V_i) is of the form (x_n, V_n) for some n and so $x_n \in C_{2n-1} \subseteq U$; so (3) is satisfied.

Next, let $x \in X$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Choose $k \geq m$ so that $x = x_k$ (such an integer exists for otherwise $\{i |\ x \in V_i\}$ would be finite and $\{x\} = \bigcap\{V_i |\ x \in V_i\}$ would be open). By construction, if $n := 2k$ then $x \in C_{n+1}$ and $U_n(x) \subseteq C_{n+1}$, whilst if $n := 2k+1$ then $x \neq C_{n+1}$ and $U_n(x) \cap C_{n+1} \neq \varnothing$. Thus conditions (4) and (5) are satisfied.

Condition (4) (respectively (5)) shows that every member of $f(X)$ is a left (respectively right) limit in $f(X)$, and so every element of $f(X)$ is a two-sided limit in $f(X)$. To see this for (4), let $x \in X$, $\epsilon > 0$, m

be such that $3^{-m} < \epsilon$, and $n \geq m$ such that $x \in C_{n+1}$ and $U_n(x) \nsubseteq C_{n+1}$, and let $y \in U_n(x) \backslash C_{n+1}$. Since $y \in U_n(x)$ we have that if $1 \leq r \leq n$ then $f_r(y) = f_r(x)$. But also $f_{n+1}(x) = 2$ and $f_{n+1}(x) = 0$. So

$$f(x) - f(y) \geq 2 \cdot 3^{-(n+1)} - \sum_{n+2}^{\infty} 2 \cdot 3^{-r} = 3^{-(n+1)} > 0,$$

so that $f(x) > f(y)$, while at the same time

$$f(x) - f(y) \leq \sum_{n+1}^{\infty} 2 \cdot 3^{-r} = 3^{-n} \leq 3^{-m} < \epsilon.$$

Thus $f(x) \in (f(x) - \epsilon, f(x))$, and since ϵ was arbitrary, $f(x)$ is a left limit in $f(X)$.

To complete the proof, note that if a set S is a countable subset of $\mathbb{R}$ every point in which is a two-sided limit in S, then it is densely-ordered by $\leq$ and has no maximum nor minimum, and so by Cantor's theorem is order-isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}$. That every point is a two-sided limit in S means that the order-topology on S is the same as that induced from $\mathbb{R}$. So the order-isomorphism of S to $\mathbb{Q}$ is a homomorphism. □

As a corollary Sierpiński showed that any countable metric space is homeomorphic to a subset of $\mathbb{Q}$.

There is yet another method for proving Sierpiński's Theorem, one that singles out the essential ingredient as being that the usual topology on $\mathbb{Q}$ has a countable base $\mathbb{B}$ of clopen subsets that under the operations of union, intersection and complementation in $\mathbb{Q}$ forms a Boolean algebra all of whose non-empty members are infinite, and for which if $p \neq q$ with $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$ then $\exists b \in \mathbb{B}$ with $x \in b$ and $y \notin b$. As an example of such a generating set take the set of intervals of the form $(\pi + a, \pi + b) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$. It is the uniqueness up to isomorphism of this structure that leads to the uniqueness of the rational topology in the following way [**528**].

If $\mathbb{B}_1$ is a Boolean algebra generated by a countable base of clopen sets for X. Assuming that X has no isolated points is equivalent to taking all nonempty members of $\mathbb{B}_1$ to be infinite. If $\mathbb{B}_2$ is the corresponding Boolean algebra for the topology on $\mathbb{Q}$, derived from a countable base for clopen sets, then from [**528**, Theorem 2.1] there is an isomorphism from $\mathbb{B}_1$ to $\mathbb{B}_2$ induced by a bijection from X to $\mathbb{Q}$, which is the required homeomorphism.

8.8. Theorem (Truss). *The groups* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ *for* $2 \leq m \leq \aleph_0$ *can be embedded in the group* $H(\mathbb{Q})$.

Proof. By going colourblind in pairs of colours it is possible to embed $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m_2,\omega})$ into $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m_1,\omega})$ for $m_1 \leq m_2$, so we can restrict

ourselves to $\mathfrak{R}$. Let $\mathbb{B}$ be the Boolean algebra generated by neighbourhood sets $N(x) := \{z : z \sim x, \text{where } x, z \in \mathfrak{R}\}$. The aim is to show that $\mathbb{B}$ is countable and that its elements are empty or infinite subsets of $\mathfrak{R}$, closed under the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$, such that for any distinct $x, y \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$, $\exists b \in \mathbb{B}$ with $x \in b$ and $y \notin b$. For then it would follow that the topology with base $\mathbb{B}$ is homeomorphic to that on $\mathbb{Q}$, and therefore that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ embeds into $H(\mathbb{Q})$.

Consider elements of $\mathbb{B}$ of the form

$$X = N(x_1) \cap \ldots N(x_k) \cap (\mathfrak{R} \backslash N(y_1)) \cap \ldots \cap (\mathfrak{R} \backslash N(y_l)).$$

If $X \neq \varnothing$ then $x_i \neq y_j$ for each i, j. If $A \subset \mathfrak{R}$ is any finite subset then by the $(*)$-property $\exists z \notin A$ such that $z \sim x_i$ and $z \not\sim y_j$ for each i, j. So $z \in X$ and so $X \backslash A \neq \varnothing$. Since A was an arbitrary finite set, X must be infinite. So all non-empty members of $\mathbb{B}$ are infinite.

Furthermore, $\forall x, y \in \mathfrak{R}$ and $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}), y \in gN(x) \Leftrightarrow g^{-1}y \in N(x) \Leftrightarrow x \sim g^{-1}y$ in $\mathfrak{R} \Leftrightarrow gx \sim y$ in $\mathfrak{R} \Leftrightarrow y \in N(gx)$, so that $gN(x) = N(gx) \in \mathbb{B}$. So $\mathbb{B}$ is closed under the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

Finally, if $x \neq y$, it follows from the $(*)$-property there is z joined to x but not to y, so $x \in N(z)$ and $y \notin N(z)$. □

The group $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R})$ of automorphisms and *anti-automorphisms* (permutations which change all adjacencies), of $\mathfrak{R}$ is 2-transitive, contains $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ as a subgroup of index 2, but is not 3-transitive because vertex triples containing 0 or 3 edges of $\mathfrak{R}$ are not equivalent to triples containing 1 or 2 edges. To see that the embedding of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ in $H(\mathbb{Q})$ does not extend to $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R})$, consider a neighbourhood $N(U)$ of a finite set U in which $\{z_1, z_2, z' \in N(U) \mid z_1 \not\sim z_2, z_1 \not\sim z', z_2 \sim z'\}$. That such three points can be found with this configuration is made possible by repeated application of $(*)$. Then if $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ such that $z_1 g = z_2, z'g = z_1, z_2 g = z', zg = z \ \forall z \in N(U) \backslash \{z_1, z_2, z'\}$ we have that the triple $\{u_1 \sim z_1, u_1 \sim z', z_1 \not\sim z'\}$ is mapped to $\{u_1 \sim z_1, u_1 \sim z', z_1 \sim z'\}$. So $g \in H(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R})$. To see that $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R})$ cannot be embedded in $H(\mathbb{Q})$, note that the intersection of a closed set (of the form a vertex together with its neighbours) and an open set (of the form a vertex together with its non-neighbours) is a single point, and as we already noted singleton sets can only support the discrete topology, which is the largest topology containing all subsets (and in particular every point in the topological space) as open sets.

Finally, from [**528**] we have that $H(\mathbb{Q})$ can neither be embedded in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ nor in $\mathrm{AAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ for any $2 \leq m \leq \aleph_0$.

6. Topologies on Random Graphs

As we noted at the beginning of the last section, Mekler [**391**] and Truss [**528**] gave a necessary and sufficient condition (called the *mimicking property* or *strong Mekler criterion*) for a countable group to be a subgroup of the group of homeomorphisms of $\mathbb{Q}$: the intersection of the supports of any finite number of elements should be empty or infinite. We also noted that the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is uncountable so the criterion does not apply, though the intersection property is still obeyed. However, we will see that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q})$. The argument involves constructing the topology of $\mathbb{Q}$ from $\mathfrak{R}$. We will also reveal another interesting topology.

If $\mathscr{F}$ is a filter, then $\mathscr{F} \cup \{\varnothing\}$ is a topology with the same automorphism group. It is worth noting, however, that there are a couple of topologies on $\mathfrak{R}$ related to $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}} \cup \{\varnothing\}$ which are in some sense more natural.

In the first topology $\mathcal{T}$, a sub-basis for the open sets consists of the closed neighbourhoods of vertices. Thus the open sets are all unions of sets which are finite intersections of closed neighbourhoods.

The topology $\mathcal{T}$ is not Hausdorff: in fact, any two open sets have non-empty intersection. For it suffices to show this for basic open sets; and the intersection of two finite intersections of neighbourhoods is itself a finite intersection of neighbourhoods, and so is non-empty.

However, this topology does satisfy the T_1 separation condition: for, given distinct points x and y, there is a vertex v joined to x but not y, and so a neighbourhood containing x but not y. Hence all singletons (and so all finite sets) are closed.

We used closed neighbourhoods in the construction of $\mathcal{T}$. In fact, open neighbourhoods would have given us the same topology, as we will now see.

Let $\mathfrak{B}$ denote the generic bipartite graph. Consider the three topologies which have the following as the points and sub-basic open sets:

- $\mathcal{T}$: points are vertices of $\mathfrak{R}$, sub-basic open sets are open vertex neighbourhoods.
- $\mathcal{T}^*$: points are vertices of $\mathfrak{R}$, sub-basic open sets are closed vertex neighbourhoods.
- $\mathcal{T}^\dagger$: points are in one bipartite block in $\mathfrak{B}$, sub-basic open sets are neighbourhoods of vertices in the other bipartite block.

8.9. PROPOSITION. (a) *The three topologies defined above are all homeomorphic.*

(b) *The homeomorphism group of these topologies is highly transitive.*

PROOF. We construct two bipartite graphs $\mathfrak{B}_1$ and $\mathfrak{B}_2$ as follows. The vertex set of each graph is $V(\mathfrak{R}) \times \{0,1\}$; vertices $(v,0)$ and $(w,1)$ are adjacent if and only if

- $v \sim w$ in $\mathfrak{R}$ (for $\mathfrak{B}_1$);
- $v = w$ or $v \sim w$ in $\mathfrak{R}$ (for $\mathfrak{B}_2$).

The characteristic property of $\mathfrak{R}$ shows that both bipartite graphs satisfy the characteristic property of the generic bipartite graph $\mathfrak{B}$; recall that $\mathfrak{B}$ is characterised as a countable bipartite graph by the following property:

> Given two finite disjoint sets X, Y of vertices in the same bipartite block, there exists a vertex z in the other block such that $z \sim x$ for all $x \in X$, and $z \not\sim y$ for all $y \in Y$.

It is clear from the property of $\mathfrak{R}$ that both $\mathfrak{B}_1$ and $\mathfrak{B}_2$ satisfy this condition, and so $\mathfrak{B}_1 \cong \mathfrak{B}_2 \cong \mathfrak{B}$.

It follows immediately that the three topologies are homeomorphic. Moreover, the stabilizer of a bipartite block in $\mathfrak{B}$ acts on it as a group of homeomorphisms of the topology $\mathcal{T}^\dagger$, and this group is highly transitive. (This follows from the homogeneity of $\mathfrak{B}$ as a graph with bipartition: any two vertices in the same bipartite block have distance 2, so any bijection between finite subsets of a bipartite block extends to an automorphism of $\mathfrak{B}$). □

Remark (a) The topologies $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}^*$, though homeomorphic, are not identical. Indeed, the identity map is a continuous bijection from $\mathcal{T}^*$ to $\mathcal{T}$ but not a homeomorphism.

To see this, note first that, since the topology $\mathcal{T}^*$ is T_1, every singleton is closed, and so $\mathfrak{R}(v) = (\mathfrak{R}(v) \cup \{v\}) \setminus \{v\}$ is open in $\mathcal{T}^*$. It follows that any open set in $\mathcal{T}$ is also open in $\mathcal{T}^*$.

In the other direction, suppose that $\mathfrak{R}(v) \cup \{v\}$ is open in $\mathcal{T}$. Then it is a union of basic open sets. We can take one of these sets to be $\mathfrak{R}(v)$; let the other be $\bigcap_{x \in X} \mathfrak{R}(x)$ for some finite set X. Then v is joined to all vertices in X, but the remaining common neighbours of these vertices are all in $\mathfrak{R}(v)$. So no point is joined to all vertices in X but not to v, a contradiction.

(b) In terms of graph vertices and neighbourhoods, three of the separation axioms in the appendix, read as follows:-

- T_0 is $v \notin \Gamma(w) \wedge w \notin \Gamma(v)$;
- R_0 is $v \notin \overline{\Gamma(w)} \wedge w \notin \overline{\Gamma(v)}$ but we can have $\Gamma(w) \subsetneq \Gamma(v)$ or $\Gamma(v) \subsetneq \Gamma(w)$;
- R_1 is $v \notin \overline{\Gamma(w)} \wedge w \notin \overline{\Gamma(v)}$ & $\Gamma(v) \cap \Gamma(w) = \varnothing$;

So $\mathcal{T}$ is T_0 and R_0 but not R_1, whilst both R_0 and R_1 imply that $v \neq w$ and so $\mathfrak{B}_2$ is only T_0 and so whilst $\mathfrak{B}_1 \cong \mathfrak{B}_2$, they are not identical.

The second topology $\mathcal{U}$ is obtained by symmetrising this one with respect to the graph $\mathfrak{R}$ and its complement $\mathfrak{R}^c$; in other words, we also take closed neighbourhoods in $\mathfrak{R}^c$ to be open sets. So a basis for the open sets consists of all sets of the form

$$Z(U,V) = \{z \in V(R) : (\forall u \in U)(z \sim u) \wedge (\forall v \in V)(z \not\sim v)\}$$

for finite disjoint sets U and V. Again it holds that all the non-empty open sets are infinite. This time the topology is totally disconnected. For given $u \neq v$, there is a point $z \in Z(\{u\},\{v\})$; then the open neighbourhood of z is open and closed in the topology and contains u but not v.

By Sierpiński's Theorem, (see also [**415**]), this topology is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}$. So $\mathfrak{R}$ as a countable topological space is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}$.

8.10. Theorem. *Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a countable, second countable, totally disconnected topological space with no isolated points. Then $\mathcal{U}$ is homeomorphic to the usual topology on $\mathbb{Q}$.*

There are several open questions about the topology $\mathcal{T}$.

- Since $\mathcal{T}$ is a coarsening of $\mathcal{U}$, there must be an identification of it with $\mathbb{Q}$ such that the open sets in $\mathcal{T}$ are open in $\mathbb{Q}$. Can such an identification be found explicitly?
- Is there a characterisation of $\mathcal{T}$, along the lines of Sierpiński's Theorem?
- The homeomorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}^\dagger)$ has as a subgroup the group $\mathrm{Aut}'(\mathfrak{B})$ induced on a bipartite block of $\mathfrak{B}$ by its setwise stabilizer in the automorphism group of $\mathfrak{B}$. This group is highly transitive. Is it equal to $\mathrm{Aut}(T^\dagger)$ or not?
- How are the homeomorphisms of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}^*$ related to the groups of Section 3? Since $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}$ consists of all sets containing a non-empty $\mathcal{T}$-open set, we see that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$; do any further relations hold?

We cannot answer these questions, but we present here a programme which might lead to an affirmative answer for the third question (which would have implications for the second as well).

Call an open set U *full* if, for all $x \notin U$, the set $U \cup \{x\}$ is not open. By the argument used previously to show that the topologies $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}^*$ are different, we see that any positive Boolean combination of neighbourhoods in $\mathcal{T}^\dagger$ (that is, any finite union of basic open sets) is full.

Is it true that these are the only full open sets in $\mathcal{T}^\dagger$?

If so, then we can recognise the basic open sets as the full open sets which are not proper finite unions of full open sets; and then the neighbourhoods are the basic open sets which are maximal under inclusion. So we can recover the graph $\mathfrak{B}$ from the topology, and every homeomorphism is a graph automorphism.

7. The $\mathfrak{R}$-uniform Hypergraph $\mathfrak{RHyp}$

Results of Claude Laflamme, Norbert Sauer and Maurice Pouzet in [**349**] communicated to us via Robert Woodrow concern the hypergraph $\mathfrak{RHyp}$ on the vertex set of $\mathfrak{R}$ whose edges are those sets of vertices which induce a copy of $\mathfrak{R}$. Note that a cofinite subset of an edge is an edge.

In this section we will connect groups related to this hypergraph to the groups that have arisen in this and the previous chapter.

There are two interesting groups here; we shall call these the LPS groups.

- $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$;
- $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})$, the group of permutations g with the property that, for every edge E, there is a finite subset $S \subset E$ such that $(E\backslash S)g$ and $(E\backslash S)g^{-1}$ are edges. This is the group of almost automorphisms for $\mathfrak{RHyp}$.

In the definition of $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})$ both conditions are necessary, for choose an infinite clique $C \subset \mathfrak{R}$, and partition $\mathfrak{R}$ into two edges A and B. Then it is shown in [**349**] that there exists $g \in \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R})$ such that $(E)g$ is an edge for any any edge E, and such that $Cg = A$. But clearly $(A\backslash S)g^{-1}$ is not an edge for any (finite) S.

8.11. Proposition. (a) $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp}) < \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.
(b) $\mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R}) \le \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$ *and* $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}) \le \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.
(c) $\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}) \le \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})$ *but* $\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp}) = 1$.

Proof. (a) follows from (c).

(b) If we alter a finite number of adjacencies at any point of $\mathfrak{R}$, the result is still isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$. So induced copies of $\mathfrak{R}$ are preserved by $\mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R})$. Similarly, given an element of $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})$, if we throw

away the vertices where infinitely many adjacencies are changed, we have the case of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.

(c) If g is finitary and S is its support, then g restricted to $E\backslash S$ is the identity for any edge E.

Choose any vertex v and let E be its set of neighbours in $\mathfrak{R}$ (this set is an edge of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$). Now, for any finitary permutation, there is a conjugate of it whose support contains v and is contained in $\{v\} \cup E$. Then $Eg = E \cup \{v\}\backslash\{w\}$ for some $\{w\}$. But the induced subgraph on this set is not isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$, since v is joined to all other vertices. □

It is obvious that if G is any subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R})$ not containing $\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R})$, then $G.\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R})$ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R})$ containing G, and is highly transitive.

8.12. Lemma. *Any overgroup of* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ *which is not contained in* $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ *is highly transitive.*

Proof. Let $G \geq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$, and suppose that G is not n-transitive. Let O be an orbit of G on n-tuples containing an n-clique. Since the setwise stabilizer of an n-clique in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ induces the symmetric group on it, we see that O is symmetric, and so the set O^* of n-sets supporting members of O is not trivial. But since $G \geq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ and $\mathfrak{R}$ is homogeneous, O^* is specified by the set of isomorphism types of subgraphs induced; so $\mathrm{Aut}(O)$ is a reduct of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$. Then $G \leq \mathrm{Aut}(O) \leq \mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ by Thomas' theorem. □

The next result gives some information about how the LPS groups are connected to the reducts.

8.13. Proposition. (a) $\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R}) < \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.
(b) $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}) \not\leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.

Proof. (a) Clear since $\mathfrak{R}$ is self-complementary.

(b) We show that $\mathfrak{R}$ can be switched into a graph isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ in such a way that some induced copy of $\mathfrak{R}$ has an isolated vertex after switching. Then the isomorphism is a switching-automorphism but not an automorphism of $\mathfrak{RHyp}$.

Let p, q be two vertices of $\mathfrak{R}$. We shall work with the graph $\mathfrak{R}_1 = \mathfrak{R}\backslash\{p\} \cong \mathfrak{R}$. Let A, B, C, D be the sets of vertices joined respectively to p and q, p but not q, q but not p, and neither p nor q. Let σ be the switching operation of $\mathfrak{R}_1$ with respect to C, and let $E = \{q\} \cup B \cup C$. It is clear that, after the switching σ, the vertex q is isolated in E. So we must prove two claims:

Claim 1: E induces a copy $\mathfrak{R}$.

For take U, V to be finite disjoint subsets of E. We may assume without loss of generality that $q \in U \cup V$.

Case 1: $q \in U$. Choose a witness for $(U, V \cup \{p\})$ in $\mathfrak{R}$. Then $z \not\in p$ and $z \sim q$, so $z \in C$; thus z is a witness for (U, V) in E.

Case 2: $q \in V$. Now choose a witness for $(U \cup \{p\}, V)$ in $\mathfrak{R}$; the argument is similar.

Claim 2: $\sigma(\mathfrak{R}_1) \cong \mathfrak{R}$.

Choose U, V finite disjoint subsets of $\mathfrak{R}\backslash\{p\}$. Again, without loss, $q \in U \cup V$. Set $U_1 = U \cap C, U_2 = U\backslash U_1$, and $V_1 = V \cap C, V_2 = V\backslash V_1$.

Case 1: $q \in U$, so $q \in U_2$. Take z to be a witness for $(U_2 \cup V_1 \cup \{p\}, U_1 \cup V_2)$ in $\mathfrak{R}$. Then $z \sim p, q$ so $z \in A$. The switching σ changes its adjacencies to U_1 and V_1, so in $\sigma(\mathfrak{R}_1)$ it is a witness for $(U_1 \cup U_2, V_1 \cup V_2)$.

Case 2: $q \in V$, so $q \in V_2$. Now take z to be a witness for $(U_1 \cup V_2, U_2 \cup V_1 \cup \{p\})$ in $\mathfrak{R}$. Then $z \sim q, z \nsim p$, so $z \in C$, and σ changes its adjacencies to U_2 and V_2, making it a witness for $(U_1 \cup U_2, V_1 \cup V_2)$. □

The following result shows that the LPS groups are incomparable to the automorphism group of the neighbourhood filter of $\mathfrak{R}$.

8.14. Proposition. $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp}) \not\leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$.

Proof. Choose $v \in \mathfrak{R}$, and suppose that $\mathfrak{R}^{\sigma(v)}$ is $\mathfrak{R}$ except for switching about v. Then exists an isomorphism $g : \mathfrak{R}^{\sigma(v)} \to \mathfrak{R}$. Since $\mathfrak{R}^{\sigma(v)}$ is vertex-transitive, we can assume that $v \in \mathrm{fix}(g)$. So $g : \mathfrak{R}(v) \to \mathfrak{R}_1 := V(\mathfrak{R})\backslash(\{v\} \cup \mathfrak{R}(v))$. But $\mathfrak{R}(v)$ is an edge of $\mathfrak{RHyp}$. So $g \in \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})\backslash \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$. But then $g \not\in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$, since otherwise $\mathfrak{R}_1(v) \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}$, which is impossible since $\mathfrak{R}(v) \cap \mathfrak{R}_1(v) = \varnothing$. So $\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp}) \not\leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$.

□

We note that FSym acts locally, having a local effect on $\mathfrak{R}$ or $\mathfrak{RHyp}$; $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ acts locally having a global effect on $\mathfrak{R}$; $\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ acts globally having a global effect on $\mathfrak{R}$.

A recent collaboration [**118**] has extended the work of this section. In this paper, a further group is defined

- $\mathrm{FAut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$, the group of permutations g with the property that there is a finite subset $S \subset \mathfrak{R}$ such that for every edge E, both $(E\backslash S)g$ and $(E\backslash S)g^{-1}$ are edges.

and the following results are proved,

8.15. THEOREM.
(i) $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp}) < \mathrm{FAut}(\mathfrak{RHyp}) < \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.
(ii) $\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}) < \mathrm{FAut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.
(iii) $\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}) < \mathrm{FAut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$, *but* $\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}) \cap \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp}) = 1$.
(iv) $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp}).\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}) < \mathrm{FAut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.
(v) $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}) \leq \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.
(vi) $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R}) \leq \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.
(vii) $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}) \not\leq \mathrm{FAut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.
(viii) $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}) \not\leq \mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})$.

We display the groups we have encountered in this and the previous chapter, together with some of their inclusions in the following diagram. We make three observations:-

(i) $\mathrm{FSym}(\mathfrak{R}) = B(\mathscr{F}_{Frechet})$.

(ii) $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}^*) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}^\dagger)$, by Proposition 8.9.

(iii) We have omitted the groups $\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R})$ and $\mathrm{NS}(\mathfrak{R})$ that we found in the previous chapter, as they are not permutation groups. It would be interesting though to investigate if and how they relate to the 14 minimal functions on the random graph found by Bodirsky and Pinsker in [**51**].

Open Question Is it true that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}) < \mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$?

Group inclusions involving $\mathrm{FAut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$ can be found in [**118**].



FIGURE 1. Hasse Diagram for the groups considered

8. Stone–Čech Compactification

In this section we see what the Stone–Čech compactification (maximal) compactification of a topological spacelooks like for neighbourhood filters on graphs.

Historically, Grothendieck viewed a space X as being described by a topos of sheaves over X (an object whose truth values correspond to the open sets of X), in which each point $x \in X$ has associated with it a filter of open neighbourhoods of x, these being the open subsets of X containing a. This identifies a point with a filter. This led Bourbaki to construct the completion of a uniform space and various compactifications including the Stone–Čech compactification [**133**].

Recall the basic definitions. Let X be an infinite set. A *filter* on X is a family $\mathscr{F}$ of subsets of X which is

- *closed upwards*, i.e. $A \in \mathscr{F}$ and $B \supseteq A$ imply $B \in \mathscr{F}$;
- *closed under intersection*, i.e. $A, B \in \mathscr{F}$ implies $A \cap B \in \mathscr{F}$.

A filter $\mathscr{F}$ is *non-trivial* if $\varnothing \notin \mathscr{F}$. The word 'filter' below will always mean 'non-trivial filter'. (The only trivial filter is the power set of X.)

An *ultrafilter* is a filter $\mathscr{F}$ with the property that for any subset A, either $A \in \mathscr{F}$ or $X \setminus A \in \mathscr{F}$ (but not both, since $\mathscr{F}$ is non-trivial). Assuming the axiom of choice (as we do from now on), ultrafilters are the same as maximal filters.

Let X^* be the set of ultrafilters on X. For any $x \in X$, the set $\mathscr{F}_x = \{A : x \in A\}$ is an ultrafilter (such ultrafilters are called *principal*). The map $x \mapsto \mathscr{F}_x$ embeds X into X^*.

Clearly any permutation group on X induces a permutation group on X^*.

For any subset $A \subseteq X$, let A^* be the set of all ultrafilters containing A. Clearly X^* has the same meaning under this redefinition, and $\varnothing^* = \varnothing$. Moreover, $(A \cap B)^* = A^* \cap B^*$. (For an ultrafilter containing $A \cap B$ must contain A and B, and conversely.)

Finally, we have $A^* \cap X = A$ for any $A \subseteq X$ (where X is identified with the set of principal ultrafilters).

Thus the sets A^*, for all $A \subseteq X$, form the basis of a topology $\mathcal{T}$ on X^* (that is, the open sets of $\mathcal{T}$ are all unions of sets of the form A^*), and the induced topology on X is the discrete topology. Permutations on X induce homeomorphisms of this topology.

8.16. Proposition. *The topological space $(X^*, \mathcal{T})$ is compact.*

Proof We have to show that any covering of X^* by open sets has a finite sub-covering.

It is enough to consider coverings by basic open sets. For given any covering $(U_i : i \in I)$, where $U_i = \bigcup_{j\in I_i} A^*_{i,j}$, we have a covering by the basic open sets $A^*_{i,j}$ for all $i \in I$, $j \in I_i$. If such a covering has a finite sub-covering $A^*_{i_1,j_1}, \ldots, A^*_{i_n,j_n}$, then the original covering has a finite subcovering by $U_{i_1}, \ldots, U_{i_n}$.

So suppose that $(A^*_i : i \in I)$ is a covering of X^*. Let us suppose, for a contradiction, that this covering has no finite sub-covering. The sets $(A_i : i \in I)$ form a covering of X. (For, if these sets don't contain a point x, then the principal ultrafilter $\mathscr{F}_x$ lies in no set A^*_i.) This covering has no finite sub-covering: for, if

$$A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_n = X,$$

then

$$A^*_1 \cup \cdots \cup A^*_n = X^*,$$

contrary to assumption. Equivalently, the family $(A^c_i : i \in I)$ of complements of the sets A_i has the property that any finite subfamily has non-empty intersection. Thus, the collection of all sets containing finite intersections of members of this family is a (non-trivial) filter. Let $\mathscr{F}$ be an ultrafilter containing it.

By assumption, $\mathscr{F}$ is covered by the sets $(A^*_i : i \in I)$; that is, $A_i \in \mathscr{F}$ for some i. But, by assumption, $\mathscr{F}$ contains A^c_i, and hence contains $\varnothing$, a contradiction.

So the result is proved.

We want to show that (a) X^* is *maximal*, (b) X^* is *unique*.

(a) To show that X^* is a maximal compactification of X we can simply show that every compactification of X is equivalent to a quotient space of X^*. For this it suffices to find a continuous surjective closed map $f : X^* \to Y$, where Y is an arbitrary compactification.

Certainly for any $A \subseteq X$, the map $f : A^* \to A^* \cap X = A$ is surjective. If A is a basic open set of the subcovering of Y, then $h_1 : A^* \to A^* \cap Y = A$ is surjective. This map is closed because the subcovering of Y is finite. Given the embedding $h : X \to X^*$ then it is clear that $h_1(f^{-1}(A)) = A$, and so f is continuous.

(b) Suppose that X_i $(i = 1, 2)$ are two compactifications of X and that $\kappa_i : X_i \to X^*$ are embeddings that extend the embedding $\kappa : X \to X^*$. Then κ_i maps X onto $\kappa(X)$. The κ_i are continuous (because all functions between topological spaces where the domain has the discrete topology are continuous) and so map X into the closure $\overline{\kappa(X)}$ of $\kappa(X)$. But also the subspaces $\kappa_i(X_i)$ contains X and are compact and so closed, and therefore they contain $\overline{X}$. So $\kappa_i(X_i) = \overline{X}$, and $\kappa_2^{-1}\kappa_1$ is a homeomorphism stabilizing X.

Remark The space X^* is the *Stone–Čech compactification* of the discrete space X. Our formulation of the Stone–Čech compactification is not the most general, but it is pertinent to a discussion in terms of filters. The theory applies more generally to completely regular topological spaces and arbitrary metric spaces; see [**311**] [**542**].

That any two Stone–Čech compactifications of the same topological space X are homeomorphic, follows from (b) above by taking X_i to be X_i^* and noting that by uniqueness, $X_1^* \leq X_2^* \leq X_1^*$.

8.17. Corollary. *X embeds* densely *in X^*, that is the closure of X in X^* is X^*.*

Proof We can restrict to working with basic open sets. Take any such subset $A \subseteq X$. Any open set in X^* has a finite subcovering. Each of the sets that form this subcovering contains a principal ultrafilter. (That X is countable and that any ultrafilter defining A is closed under countable intersections implies that the ultrafilter is principal). The principal ultrafilters $\mathscr{F}_A$ generated by A all contain points of A. So given the embedding $\iota : A \to \mathscr{F}_A$, every non-empty open set in X^* contains $\iota(A)$ and so contains each $\mathscr{F}_A$ and so has a non-empty inverse image under ι and so contains A. Therefore the image of ι is dense, and the result follows. (In terms of closures, note that given $\kappa : X \to X^*$, if $\kappa(X)$ denotes a subspace of X^* and $\overline{\kappa(X)}$ denotes its closure in X^*, then $\overline{\kappa(X)}$ is a compact Hausdorff space and $\overline{X} = \overline{\kappa(X)}$; so $\overline{\kappa(X)}$ is a compactification of $\kappa(X)$).

Caveat

Here is another example of two different topologies on the same set giving rise to different properties.

Pestov [**428**] proved the following theorem (see also [**326**]):

> Let G be a group of automorphisms of an infinite linearly ordered set X acting transitively on n-subsets of X for each n. Equip G with the topology of pointwise convergence. Then every continuous action of the topological group G on a compact space has a fixed point. Equivalently, the universal minimal G-flow is a singleton: $U(G) = \{*\}$.

Take the linearly ordered set X to be $\mathbb{Q}$; we may as well take G to be the group of all order-automorphisms of $\mathbb{Q}$.

Now take the discrete topology on $\mathbb{Q}$, and let U be its Stone–Čech compactification. Thus U consists of all ultrafilters on the countable set $\mathbb{Q}$. A basis for the open sets of U consists of the sets $\mathscr{F}(A)$ for $A \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$, where $\mathscr{F}(A)$ is the set of ultrafilters containing A. (We have

$\mathscr{F}(A \cap B) = \mathscr{F}(A) \cap \mathscr{F}(B)$, so the set of all unions $\bigcup_{i\in I} \mathscr{F}(A_i)$ is a topology. It is well known that it is compact.) The action of G on U is obviously continuous.

By Pestov's Theorem, G fixes a point in U, that is, an ultrafilter $\mathscr{F}$ on $\mathbb{Q}$.

But this is impossible. For let $A = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}[2n, 2n+1)$. Then exactly one of A or its complement belongs to F. But the translation $x \mapsto x+1$ in G maps A to its complement!

The answer to the apparent contradiction is that Pestov takes the usual permutation topology on the rationals whereas we have assumed the discrete topology. This gives a different topology on the group of order-preserving permutations. So the action of the group on the Stone–Čech compactification is not continuous for this topology.

Moreover, there is a natural compactification of $\mathbb{Q}$: embed it in $\mathbb{R}$ and take the one-point compactification - this is a minimal compactification as opposed to Stone–Čech which is maximal. Then the one added point is fixed.

9. Other Graphs

Let $\Gamma_i(x)$ denote the set of vertices at distance i from a vertex x in the graph Γ, and $\overline{\Gamma}_k(x) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} \Gamma_i(x)$ denote the set of vertices within a distance k from x.

A graph Γ with a path metric gives rise to a metric space $(V(\Gamma), d)$ where the distance $d(x, y)$ is the shortest path joining x and y, and the largest value taken by d is the *graph diameter*.

Which graphs have the property that the sets $\overline{\Gamma}_k(x)$ generate a non-trivial filter, for some fixed k? Clearly we require that the diameter of such graphs to be at most $2k$, else there are vertices x and y such that $\overline{\Gamma}_k(x) \cap \overline{\Gamma}_k(y) = \varnothing$. So defining the *$k$-neighbourhood* of a vertex v in Γ to be the set of points distant at most k from v, we require two k–neighbourhoods to not be disjoint. Moreover, we can assume that the diameter is at least $k+1$, else every k-neighbourhood is the whole vertex set, $\overline{\Gamma}_k(x) = V(\Gamma)$ for all vertices x.

We make the following observation. For every positive integer d, there is a countable homogeneous universal *integral metric space* (one with integer distances) of diameter d, unique up to isometry; see [**106**]. The metric is the path metric in a graph M_d of diameter d. Thus M_2 is the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$.

It is easy to show that the filter generated by the k-neighbourhoods in M_{2k} is isomorphic to $\mathscr{F}_{\mathfrak{R}}$.

Is the following question true? *Let Γ be a countable graph whose k-neighbourhoods generate a non-trivial filter. Then M_{2k} is a spanning subgraph of Γ.*

What can be said about other distance classes?

10. Appendix: Graphs Spanned by $\mathfrak{R}$

We first prove the following; (see also [**121**])

8.18. Theorem. *A countable graph Γ contains $\mathfrak{R}$ as a spanning subgraph if and only if any finite set of vertices has a common neighbour in Γ.*

Proof. Let $V(\Gamma) = \{v_0, v_1, \ldots\}$ and $V(\mathfrak{R}) = \{w_0, w_1, \ldots\}$. We construct a bijection ϕ from $V(\mathfrak{R})$ and $V(\Gamma)$ by back-and-forth, which as so often with the random graph is the proof method of choice.

At even-numbered stages, choose the first unused vertex w of $\mathfrak{R}$. Let U and V be the sets of neighbours and non-neighbours of w among vertices on which ϕ has been defined. Choose $v \in V(\Gamma)$ joined to all vertices in $\phi(U)$, and extend ϕ to map w to v. In this extension, edges are mapped to edges.

At odd-numbered stages, choose the first unused vertex v of Γ. Let U and V be its neighbours and non-neighbours among vertices in the image of ϕ. Choose a vertex w of $\mathfrak{R}$ joined to no vertex in $\phi^{-1}(V)$, and extend ϕ to map w to v. Again, edges map to edges since the inverse image of a non-edge is a non-edge. After countably many steps we have the required bijection which takes edges of $\mathfrak{R}$ to edges of Γ.

Conversely, if Γ contains $\mathfrak{R}$ as a spanning subgraph, and U is a finite set of vertices of Γ, then a non-neighbour to U in $\mathfrak{R}$ (which certainly exists) is also a non-neighbour in Γ. □

Let Γ be *locally finite*, that is, any vertex has only finitely many neighbours. Embed Γ as a spanning subgraph of $\mathfrak{R}$, which is possible by the preceding result. Then, on removing all the edges of Γ, we obtain a graph isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$. So any locally finite graph is a spanning subgraph of R.

This result is proved by showing that property $(*)$ can be verified without using any of the removed edges.

The statement in the first section of Chapter 6 about Hamiltonian paths is a simple special case.

From this we can prove a remarkable decomposition theorem for $\mathfrak{R}$:

Let $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of locally finite graphs, each with at least one edge. Then we can decompose $\mathfrak{R}$ into spanning subgraphs isomorphic to $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \ldots$.

To see this, we first enumerate all the edges of $\mathfrak{R}$. Since the automorphism group of $\mathfrak{R}$ is edge-transitive, we can find a spanning subgraph isomorphic to Γ_1 containing the first edge in the enumeration. Remove it; the resulting graph is still isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$, so we can find a spanning subgraph isomorphic to Γ_2 containing the first unused edge in the enumeration. Iterating this procedure we find that every edge has been used.

So in particular, $\mathfrak{R}$ has a 1-factorisation, a Hamiltonian decomposition, and so on.

If we alter an arbitrary (as opposed to finite) set of edges, or switch with respect to an arbitrary set of vertices, the result is not always isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$; but it turns out that it is so 'almost always', in either sense of the word.

CHAPTER 9

Monoids, Graphs and $\mathfrak{R}$

Rather, graphs provide a fundamental notational system for concepts and relationships that are not easily expressed in the standard mathematical languages of algebraic equations and probability calculus.

Judea Pearl, *Causality. Models, Reasoning, and Inference, Second Edition, p.138 – Cambridge University Press (2009)*

We have focussed thus far in this monograph on mappings that are isomorphisms between graphs. In this chapter we turn our attention to aspects of homomorphisms between graphs in general, and the random graph in particular. After an initial introductory section we shall derive results in separate directions, topological, model-theoretic and motivated by the theory of finite synchronizing groups we briefly look at infinite graph cores and hulls.

1. Generalizations of Graph Homogeneity

Graph Homomorphism. An *arc* is a directed edge thus written as an ordered pair (x, y) instead of $\{x, y\}$. In the study of graph homomorphisms it is convenient to take *digraphs* as the most basic objects. Graphs with loops on vertices are then allowed, and a digraph is oriented if and only if it has no symmetric pairs of arcs. A loop is the arc (x, x). A *pseudograph* is a non-simple graph in which both graph loops and multiple edges are permitted, and a *reflexive graph* is a pseudograph such that each vertex has an associated graph loop.

A digraph homomorphism [**274**], $f : G \to H$, is a mapping $f(V) : V(G) \to V(H)$ such that $(f(x), f(y)) \in E(H)$ whenever $(x, y) \in E(G)$. Homomorphisms map *paths* (a sequence of adjacent vertices and edges, with distinct vertices) to walks (a path in which vertices or edges may be repeated) in a graph; if f is both vertex- and edge-bijective then it is an isomorphism. Given that graph homomorphisms generalize isomorphisms, vertex colourings and arc directions, whilst preserving adjacency, it is not surprising that there are fruitful generalizations of the theory on which this treatise is based, which would be worthy of

extension, in particular in light of [**121**] [**119**], where a study is begun of relational structures (especially graphs and posets) which satisfy the analogue of homogeneity but for homomorphisms rather than isomorphisms.

We give the basic ingredients of this theory to motivate the reader. Various notions of homogeneity arise, each being of the local-to-global variety, asserting that if two configurations have the same local structure in some sense, then they can be mapped to one another by a symmetry of the entire structure. More precisely, a relational structure M has property XY if every x-morphism between finite substructures of M can be extended to a y-morphism from M to M, where (X, x) and (Y, y) can be (I, iso), (M, mono), or (H, homo). There are six properties of this kind that can be considered: HH, MH, IH, MM, IM, and II. (Obviously a map cannot be extended to one satisfying a stronger condition.) Note that II is equivalent to the standard notion of homogeneity. These properties are related as in Figure 1 with the strongest at the top:



FIGURE 1. Relations between types of homogeneity

J. Nešetřil and P. Cameron showed [**121**] that a countable MH graph either is an extension of the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ (containing it as a spanning subgraph), or has bounded claw size. Apart from disjoint unions of complete graphs (containing no K_1 or K_2), no examples with bounded claw size are known. Extensions of $\mathfrak{R}$ are MM and HH, and hence MH.

All finite HH graphs are known. The known countable examples are disjoint unions of complete graphs of the same size, and graphs which contain the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ as an induced subgraph. In [**467**] a construction is given of graphs that do not contain $\mathfrak{R}$ as spanning subgraph, but nevertheless are HH.

The homogeneous (II) graphs were classified in [**346**] by Lachlan and Woodrow, but the classification of IH or IM graphs is open.

The graph $\mathfrak{R}$ has been proved *not* to be characterized by the properties of universality and homomorphism homogeneity [**121**].

Core-transitive Graphs. A homomorphism of graphs is a mapping of vertices which carries edges to edges; its behaviour on non-edges is unspecified. If there are homomorphisms in both directions the two graphs are said to be *homomorphism-equivalent*.

Any homomorphism-equivalence class contains a unique smallest graph (up to isomorphism) called a *core*. For any graph Γ, the core of the equivalence class $[\Gamma]$ is unique up to isomorphism and is embeddable as an induced subgraph of Γ. The core of Γ has an embedding into Γ, and there is a *retraction* from a graph to its core, that is a homomorphism which fixes its image pointwise. Alternatively, a *retraction* of a graph is an endomorphism f satisfying $f^2 = f$ (that is, f is the identity on its image). The image of a retraction is a *retract*. Given any map f from a finite set to itself, some power of it is a retract. For there is a number n such that the image of any point under f^n falls into the set of recurrent points of f; and f^n induces a permutation of the set of recurrent points, so some power of it is the identity.

As we have already noted above, Sabidussi showed [**470**] that every vertex-transitive graph is a retract of a Cayley graph. A graph is a core if it has no non-trivial retraction. A *graph endomorphism* is a homomorphism from a graph to itself. The endomorphisms of a graph form a semigroup, and a graph is a core if and only if all its endomorphisms are automorphisms. A retract is the image of an *idempotent* endomorphism of the graph. All cores of a finite graph are isomorphic, so we can speak of *the* graph core. Welzl showed [**550**] that the core of a vertex-transitive graph is vertex-transitive, but stronger statements have been proved: for example, the core of a nonedge-transitive graph is either complete or the graph is its own core. A graph Γ is called *core-transitive* if any isomorphism between cores of Γ can be extended to an automorphism of Γ. Whilst any core is core-transitive, for graphs whose core is complete this is a strong condition. We will shortly see a weakening of this condition, but first we have

9.1. Proposition. *If Γ is vertex-transitive, then so is $Core(\Gamma)$.*

Proof. Let $\iota : Core(\Gamma) \to \Gamma$ be an embedding as an induced subgraph, and $\rho : \Gamma \to Core(\Gamma)$ be a retraction. Suppose that Γ is vertex-transitive, and let v, w be vertices of $Core(\Gamma)$. If $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma) : vg = w$, then $g' = \iota g \rho$ is an endomorphism of $Core(\Gamma)$ taking v to w. Because $Core(\Gamma)$ is a core, then g' is an automorphism of $Core(\Gamma)$. □

Similarly for other kinds of transitivity.

The *hull* of a graph Γ is a graph containing Γ as a spanning subgraph, admitting all the endomorphisms of Γ, and having as core a complete graph of the same order as the core of Γ. A graph Γ is a core if and only if its hull is complete.

More on graph homomorphisms and cores can be found in [**263**] and in [**274**].

A graph is a core if and only if all its endomorphisms are automorphisms. Such graphs cannot be MM, MH or HH, and the other three classes collapse into one: $II = IM = IH$.

Core-transitivity of a graph is weaker than homogeneity, and generalizing further, we can ask for graphs in which core isomorphisms extend to mono/homomorphisms of the entire graph.

The II graphs are rare and classified, whilst the class IM requires more research.

If Γ has $\mathfrak{R}$ as a spanning subgraph, then it is MH and so IH; in particular if f is an embedding of any finite part X' of $X \cup \overline{\mathfrak{R}}(x)$ into Γ, then f can be extended into a monomorphism from $X' \cup w$ where the vertex $w \in \Gamma \backslash \{X \cup \overline{\mathfrak{R}}(x)\}$ into $Y' \cup z$ for some finite induced subgraph Y' and $z \in \Gamma \backslash \{Y \cup \overline{\mathfrak{R}}(y)\}$.

2. Graphs and Finite Transformation Monoids

This section describes a pair of mappings between graphs and transformation monoids on the set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, and some of their properties.

Let X be an n-element set, and $T(X)$ the *monoid*, that is the (full transformation) semigroup with identity, of all maps $X \to X$. Clearly $|T(X)| = n^n$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(X) \leq T(X)$. For $f \in T(X)$, the *rank* of f is the cardinality of its image. A monoid $M \leq T(X)$ is *synchronizing* if there exists an $f \in M$ whose rank is 1. Recent research interest has focussed on amongst other things, finding subsets $S \subseteq T(X)$ with $M := \langle S \rangle$.

The set of endomorphisms of a graph Γ is closed under composition and contains the identity; that is, it forms a *monoid* $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$. An endomorphism is an automorphism if it is bijective. If a graph is edge-transitive and not a core, then its core is complete, and it has among its endomorphisms both automorphisms (of maximal rank) and proper colourings (of minimal rank).

Two graphs Γ_X and Γ_Y are *hom-equivalent* if there are homomorphisms in both directions between them. A graph is a *core* if it is not hom-equivalent to any graph with fewer vertices; and Γ_Y is a core of Γ_X if Γ_Y is a core and is hom-equivalent to Γ_X.

We can recognise a core by the following property:

Fact 1 *The graph* Γ *is a core if and only if* $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$.

For if Γ_Y is a core and f an endomorphism of Γ_Y, then the image of f is hom-equivalent to Γ_Y (the homomorphism in the other direction is just the embedding), so cannot be properly contained in Γ_Y.

If Γ_Y is a core of Γ_X, then a homomorphism from Γ_Y to Γ_X is injective, and a homomorphism from Γ_X to Γ_Y is surjective. (The first holds because, if $f : Y \to X$ is non-injective and $g : X \to Y$ is any homomorphism, then fg is a non-injective endomorphism of Γ_Y. The second is similar.) The homomorphisms in both directions between them are bijective and hence are isomorphisms, and so two hom-equivalent cores are isomorphic. In other words, any graph has a unique core.

The *clique number* $\omega(\Gamma)$ is the cardinality of the largest complete induced subgraph of Γ; the *chromatic number* $\chi(\Gamma)$ is the smallest number of colours required to colour the vertices so that adjacent vertices get different colours. (It is possible for a graph to have an infinite chromatic number, for example the Henson graphs $\mathfrak{H}_k$ $(2 < k < \omega)$ [**376**, p. 81]). Clearly $\omega(\Gamma) \leq \chi(\Gamma)$, since vertices of a complete subgraph must get different colours.

Fact 2 *The core of a graph Γ is complete if and only if $\omega(\Gamma) = \chi(\Gamma)$.*

PROOF. $\omega(\Gamma) = m$ (that is an m-clique exists) if and only if there is a homomorphism $K_m \to \Gamma$, while $\chi(\Gamma) = m$ (that is an m-colouring exists) if and only if there is a homomorphism $\Gamma \to K_m$. So $\omega(\Gamma) = \chi(\Gamma) = m$ if and only if Γ is homomorphically equivalent to K_m (which is then necessarily the core of Γ). □

In the other direction, let M be a transformation monoid on the set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, a submonoid of the full transformation monoid T_n. From M, we construct a graph as follows. Its vertex set is $\{1, \ldots, n\}$; two vertices i and j are joined by an edge if and only if there is no element $f \in M$ for which $if = jf$. Denote this graph by $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$.

A transformation monoid is synchronizing if it contains an element whose image has cardinality 1.

Fact 3 *(a)* $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$ *is complete if and only if M is a permutation group (that is, contained in the symmetric group).*

(b) $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$ *is null if and only if M is synchronizing.*

PROOF. (a) $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$ is complete if and only if no element of M ever maps two points to the same place. (b) Let $f \in M$ be an element whose image is as small as possible. Then no two elements of the image of f can be mapped to the same place; so they are pairwise adjacent. So, if $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$ is null, then the image of f has cardinality 1. The converse is clear. □

Fact 4 *For any transformation monoid M, the graph $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$ has core a complete graph.*

PROOF. The argument in (b) above shows that the image of an element of M of minimal rank is a complete subgraph of $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$. It is hom-equivalent to $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$ (the homomorphism in the other direction is just the embedding), and it is clearly a core. □

Fact 5 *For any transformation monoid M, (a) $M \leq \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M))$; (b) $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M))) = \mathrm{Gr}(M)$.*

PROOF. (a) Let f be an endomorphism of M, and let i and j be adjacent in $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$. By definition, $if \neq jf$. Could if and jf be non-adjacent in $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$? If so, then there is an element $h \in \mathrm{End}(M)$ with $(if)h = jf(h)$. But this contradicts the adjacency of i and j, since $fh \in M$ by closure.

(b) Suppose first that i and j are adjacent in $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$. Then no endomorphism of $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$ can collapse them, so they are adjacent in $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M)))$. Conversely, suppose that i and j are not adjacent in $\mathrm{Gr}(M)$. Then there is an element $f \in M$ satisfying $if = jf$. By (a), $f \in \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M))$, and so i and j are non-adjacent in $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M)))$. □

It is not true that $\mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(\mathrm{End}(\Gamma))) = \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ for all graphs Γ. For let Γ be the path of length 3, with just two automorphisms. It is easy to see that no endomorphism can identify the ends of the path, so that $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathrm{End}(\Gamma))$ is the 4-cycle, with eight automorphisms.

Fact 6 *The maps $M \mapsto \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M))$ and $\Gamma \mapsto \mathrm{Gr}(\mathrm{End}(\Gamma))$ are idempotent.*

PROOF. This follows immediately from part (b) of the preceding Fact. □

Write $\mathrm{Cl}(M) = \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M))$, where $\mathrm{Cl}(M)$ denotes the *closure* of the monoid. Then $M \leq \mathrm{Cl}(M)$ and $\mathrm{Cl}(\mathrm{Cl}(M)) = \mathrm{Cl}(M)$, so $\mathrm{Cl}()$ is a closure operator on transformation monoids on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. We do not have a satisfactory description of the closed objects; but more on this below.

In the other direction, let $Hull(\Gamma) = \mathrm{Gr}(\mathrm{End}(\Gamma))$. Then we have that $Hull(Hull(\Gamma)) = Hull(\Gamma)$. The hull of a graph has the following properties:

Fact 7 *(a) Γ is a spanning subgraph of $Hull(\Gamma)$ (that is, these graphs have the same vertex set, and every edge of Γ is an edge of $Hull(\Gamma)$).*

(b) $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma) \leq \mathrm{End}(Hull(\Gamma))$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(Hull(\Gamma))$.

(c) $Core(Hull(\Gamma))$ *is a complete graph on the vertex set of* $Core(\Gamma)$.

PROOF. (a) If i and j are adjacent in Γ, then no endomorphism of Γ can collapse i and j, so they are adjacent in $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathrm{End}(\Gamma))$.

(b) Immediate from Fact 5(a).

(c) The vertex set of $Core(\Gamma)$ cannot be collapsed by endomorphisms, so is a complete subgraph of $\mathrm{Gr}(\mathrm{End}(\Gamma)) = Hull(\Gamma)$. □

By (c), if Γ is a hull, then $Core(\Gamma)$ is complete; but the converse is false. If Γ is the path of length 3, then $Core(\Gamma)$ is a complete graph on two vertices, but $Hull(\Gamma)$ is the 4-cycle, by our previous argument.

Fact 8 *A transformation monoid* M *is* closed *(that is, satifies* $M = \mathrm{Cl}(M)$*) if and only if* $M = \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ *for some graph* Γ *which is a hull (and in particular, whose core is complete).*

PROOF. Suppose that M is closed. Then $M = \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$, where $\Gamma = \mathrm{Gr}(M)$; so $\Gamma = \mathrm{Gr}(\mathrm{End}(\Gamma)) = Hull(\Gamma)$. Conversely, if $\Gamma = Hull(\Gamma)$, then $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(\mathrm{End}(\Gamma))) = \mathrm{Cl}(\mathrm{End}(\Gamma))$. □

For any graph Γ,

- $Hull(\Gamma)$ is complete if and only if Γ is a core;
- if $Hull(\Gamma) = \Gamma$ then $Core(\Gamma)$ is complete (but the converse is false).

Remark on closure. The axioms that a traditional closure operation cl should obey are [**204**]:

(C1) $A \leq \mathrm{cl}(A)$ *extensive*;

(C2) $A \leq B \Rightarrow \mathrm{cl}(A) \leq \mathrm{cl}(B)$ *isotone*;

(C3) $A \leq \mathrm{cl}(\mathrm{cl}(A)) = A$ (or $\mathrm{cl}(\mathrm{cl}(A)) = \mathrm{cl}(A)$) *idempotent*.

We have seen that $M_1 \leq M_2 \Rightarrow \mathrm{Gr}(M_2) \leq \mathrm{Gr}(M_1)$. Take $i, j \in \mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$ such that $i \sim j$. Then $i \sim j$ also in $\mathrm{Gr}(M_1)$. But if $\exists f \in \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M_2))$ such that $if = jf$ then $f \in \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M_1))$. So $\mathrm{Cl}(M) \equiv \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M))$ satisfies (C1) and (C3), but is *not* isotone, and cannot be a closure operator, as normally understood.

Finally, we reference an article [**473**] by Sauer and Stone in which monoids and their local closures are studied.

3. Hulls and Cores of Infinite Graphs

Any nonedge-transitive graph is either a core or a hull. For if f is an endomorphism of Γ mapping two non-adjacent vertices in Γ to non-adjacent vertices in $Hull(\Gamma)$ then $\Gamma = Hull(\Gamma)$. Otherwise any pair of non-adjacent vertices can be mapped to a pair that are collapsed by f and then application of f maps them to a single vertex.

We first make a few comments on infinite hulls.

If Γ is any countable graph which contains an infinite complete subgraph, then Γ is a hull. For let $K_{\aleph_0}$ be the infinite complete subgraph and v and w any two non-adjacent vertices in Γ. Choose a bijection from $\Gamma - v$ to $K_{\aleph_0}$ (this is clearly a homomorphism). Now extend it to Γ by mapping v to the same place as w. The only pair not mapped to an edge is v, w and by assumption it was not an edge in Γ.

This indicates that hulls, while easy to define in the infinite case (unlike cores), are not actually of any use. So $\mathfrak{R}$ and all its overgraphs are hulls.

Given a transformation monoid M on Ω, we can consider its closure in the topology of pointwise convergence: a sequence (f_n) of elements of M converges to the limit f if, for all $x \in \Omega$, there exists n_0 such that for all $n \geq n_0$ we have $f_n(x) = f(x)$.

Now we say that a permutation group G is *strongly synchronizing* if, for any map f which is not injective, the closure of $M = \langle G, f \rangle$ contains an element of rank 1.

A characterization of synchronizing groups that works in the infinite case is: a permutation group G is non-synchronizing if and only if there is a non-trivial hull Γ on its vertex set such that $G \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$. However in the case of infinite groups and monoids, quite unlike the finite case, there is a confluence of different concepts:

9.2. Corollary. *The following are equivalent*

- *G is synchronizing;*
- *G is strongly synchronizing;*
- *G is 2-set transitive.*

We next turn to cores, whose definition for infinite graphs is more problematic to define that for hulls. A survey on graph homomorphisms and cores can be found in [**263**], and more in [**274**].

If Γ is finite and $\exists f \in \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$ which is non-injective then Γ has a proper retract. For $\exists n : f^n$ is a permutation of the image, and then $(f^n)^k$ is the identity on the image for some k, and so a retract. We state the next result without proof.

9.3. Proposition. *The following are equivalent for a graph Γ:*
(a) A graph Γ is a core
(b) All its endomorphisms are injective.
(c) It is a minimal retract.

For finite graphs both the existence of a minimal core and its uniqueness are clear, but for infinite graphs the question is more subtle.

As was pointed out in [**263**], when an infinite graph has finite homomorphic images, compactness must be taken into account; for example an arbitrary graph admits a homomorphism to a finite graph if and only if its finite subgraphs do. Furthermore, many of the properties that hold for finite graphs, fail in the case of infinite graphs. For example, that a graph is a core if and only if every endomorphism is an automorphism was shown by Bauslaugh [**35**] not to hold for directed graphs. It is also possible to construct graphs with no core in the sense that there is no minimal retract, as per the following example [**263**, p. 158]. From the complete graphs K_k on k vertices $\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ $(k > 1)$, construct a graph γ by identifying k with v_k for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The graph γ has no core in the sense of minimal retract, because there are retraction maps $\Gamma_i \to \Gamma_j$ only if $i < j$ and so the retracts of γ are the infinite components of $\gamma - k, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Core-like properties of directed graphs and implications between these properties, are studied in [**35**], whilst other characteristics of cores of random graphs were examined in [**65**].

Two minimal requirements of the definition of a core are:

(a) it should agree with the standard definition in the case of finite graphs; and

(b) any complete graph is a core.

We will test these putative definitions against this requirement.

The first attempt is to take over the finite definition and ask that the core of a graph is the smallest graph hom-equivalent to it. This satisfies (a), but not (b). For infinite cardinals this is too crude: all countable graphs, for example, have the same number of vertices.

The second attempt is to take the definition of a core as a graph all of whose endomorphisms are automorphisms. This also satisfies (a), but not (b); for an infinite complete graph has an endomorphism onto any infinite subgraph of the same cardinality.

The third attempt builds on this. We say that a graph Γ_X is a *core* if every endomorphism is injective. This clearly satisfies (a) and (b).

The fourth definition uses retracts. A graph Γ_X is an *R-core* if its only retraction is the identity. This also satisfies (a) and (b).

Clearly any core is an R-core. For if Γ_X is a core, and f is a retraction, then $(xf)f = xf$ for all $x \in X$; and so $xf = x$, since otherwise the points x and xf witness non-injectivity of f. So f is the identity.

Open Question 1 Is the converse true? That is, are the two notions of core equivalent? (It seems possible that X could be an R-core but have a non-injective endomorphism no power of which is a retraction.)

Note that the definition of a hull works without problems in the infinite case: a graph is a hull if and only if any two non-adjacent

vertices are mapped to the same vertex by some endomorphism. Now the first definition of a core retains a property of finite graphs we saw in the preceding section: a graph is a core if and only if its hull is complete.

Here is an example of a graph that is not a core.

Let Γ_X be the disjoint union of complete graphs K_n for all positive integers n. What does a graph Γ_Y hom-equivalent to Γ_X look like? Assume that Γ_Y is a core. Let $f : \Gamma_Y \to \Gamma_X$ and $g : \Gamma_X \to \Gamma_Y$ be homomorphisms; then fg is injective, so in particular f is injective. Let v and w be vertices of Γ_Y which belong to different components of Γ_X. There is an endomorphism h of Γ_X which fixes pointwise every component except that containing vf, and maps vf to wf. Then $vfh = wfh$, so $vfhg = wfhg$; thus Γ_Y has a non-injective endomorphism, contrary to assumption.

Open Question 2 Is there an infinite graph which has no R-core?

In particular, is this true for the graph Γ_X of the preceding paragraph?

Open Question 3 Do there exist cores (in either sense) which are equivalent without being isomorphic?

If Γ_X and Γ_Y are equivalent cores, then there exist injective homomorphisms $f : \Gamma_X \to \Gamma_Y$ and $g : \Gamma_Y \to \Gamma_X$. Now one might hope that a Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein argument would produce an isomorphism betweem Γ_X and Γ_Y ; the problem is that the inverse of an injective homomorphism need not be a homomorphism.

9.4. Proposition. *A countably infinite graph containing an infinite clique is not a core unless it is complete.*

Proof. Suppose that v and w are non-adjacent vertices. There is a bijection f from $\Gamma_X \backslash \{w\}$ to a clique C of Γ_X. Extend this map to w by setting $wf = vf$. The resulting map is an endomorphism of Γ_X and is not injective.

In particular, the countable random graph (the unique countable homogeneous universal graph) is not a core.

In fact it is not an R-core either, though this is a little more diffcult. The countable random graph is characterised up to isomorphism by the property that, if U and V are disjoint finite sets of vertices, then there is a vertex z joined to everything in U and nothing in V. Now, if a countable graph is constructed by a random process such that, for any disjoint finite sets U and V, there is an infinite set Z such that the events that z is joined to all of U and none of V are independent

(for $z \in Z$) with fixed non-zero probability, then the resulting graph is almost surely isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$.

Begin with countably many pairwise disjoint countable sets $\{A_i\}$, with a chosen point $a_i \in A_i$ for all i. Now insist that the vertices a_i are pairwise adjacent, and that there are no edges within any set A_i. Then the above condition is satisfied. (Given U and V, let Z consist of all points lying in sets A_k containing none of $U \cup V$ except for the chosen points a_k in these sets). So the resulting graph is isomorphic to the random graph. Now the map that collapses every set A_i onto its representative point a_i is obviously a retraction. □

The argument actually shows that any countably infinite graph with an infinite clique is a hull. Clearly it works for any infinite graph having a clique of the same cardinality of the whole graph.

Open Question 4 What happens for countable graphs which contain arbitrarily large finite cliques but no countable cliques?

Open Question 5 What happens for uncountable graphs whose largest cliques are countably infinite?

For example, assuming the axiom of choice (AC), take a well-ordering of the real numbers, and define a graph in which v and w are joined if and only if the well-order and the usual order agree on $\{v, w\}$. It is well-known that the largest clique (and the largest independent set) in this graph are both countably infinite. Is this graph a core?

9.5. Proposition. *Let Γ_X be a graph whose automorphism group is transitive on non-edges. Then either Γ_X is an core, or it is a hull.*

Proof. If there exists a non-injective endomorphism f, with $vf = wf$, then for any non-adjacent vertices v' and w' there is an endomorphism identifying them. (Let g be an automorphism mapping $\{v, w\}$ to $\{v', w'\}$, and let $f' = g^{-1}fg$.) □

9.6. Proposition (Nick Gravin). *Let Γ_X be an infinite graph with finite clique number $\omega(X)$, and suppose that Γ_X is a hull. Then $\chi(X) = \omega(X)$.*

Proof. Given a finite subgraph Γ_Y of Γ_X, if Γ_Y is not complete, then there is an endomorphism f_1 of Γ_X collapsing a non-edge of Γ_Y; if $\Gamma_Y f_1$ is not complete, there is an endomorphism f_2 collapsing a non-edge of Yf_1; and so on. We end with a homomorphism of Γ_Y to a complete graph of size at most $\omega(X)$. So $\chi(\Gamma_Y) \leq \omega(\Gamma_X)$ for any finite subgraph Γ_Y. A compactness argument shows that $\chi(\Gamma_X) \leq \omega(\Gamma_X)$, so equality holds.

Hence, if Γ_X is non-edge-transitive and has $\omega(\Gamma_X)$ finite and $\chi(\Gamma_X) \neq \omega(\Gamma_X)$, then Γ_X is a core. Examples include the Henson graph $\mathfrak{H}_k$ $(n \geq 3)$. □

4. Fraïssé's Theorem for HH Structures

The two central results linking oligomorphic permutation groups, model theory and combinatorics are firstly Fraïssé's Theorem in which the amalgamation property to a large extent characterizes the classes of finite structures whose enumeration is equivalent to finding the number of orbits on n-sets, and secondly the Engeler–Ryll-Nardzewski–Svenonius Theorem.

In this section we prove a version of the former for HH relational structures in place of the usual universal homogeneous structures. As we have already seen, both HH and MM relational structures are subclasses of MH structures, and the statements of this section have exact analogues for MM structures and the proofs of these are in [**121**].

Concepts such age and the joint embedding property (JEP; see Appendix 4) are retained from the usual theory. A class $\mathcal{C}$ of finite relational structures satisfies the *homo-amalgamation property* (HAP) if:

for any $A, B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{C}$, and any maps $f_i : A \to B_i$ (for $i = 1, 2$) such that f_1 is an embedding (an isomorphism to an induced substructure) and f_2 a homomorphism, there exists $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and homomorphisms $g_i : B_i \to C$ for $i = 1, 2$ such that $g_1 \circ f_1 = g_2 \circ f_2$ and g_2 is an embedding.

The asymmetry between B_1 and B_2 is intentional.

The *homo-extension property* of a structure M with age $Age(M)$ is defined thus:

if $B \in Age(M)$ and A is an induced substructure of B, then every homomorphism $A \to M$ extends to a homomorphism $B \to M$.

9.7. Theorem (Fraïssé's Theorem for HH Structures). *(a) A countable structure is HH if and only if it has the homo-extension property.*

(b) The age of any HH-structure has the homo-amalgamation property.

(c) If a class $\mathcal{C}$ of finite relational structures is isomorphism-closed, closed under induced substructures, has only a countable number of isomorphism classes, and has the JEP and the HAP, then there is a countable HH structure $\mathcal{M}$ with age $\mathcal{C}$.

Proof. (a) If M has the homo-extension property, then any homomorphism from a finite substructure of M can be extended point by point to a homomorphism of M.

Conversely, let M is an HH structure. Let $B \in Age(M)$ and $A \subseteq B$; without loss of generality, $B \subseteq M$. Then any homomorphism $f : A \to M$ extends to a homomorphism of M whose restriction to B is the required homomorphism $B \to M$.

(b) Suppose that M is an HH structure and take A, B_1, B_2, f_1, f_2 to be as in the hypothesis of the HAP, with A, B_1, B_2 in $Age(M)$. Assume without loss of generality that $B_1, B_2 \subseteq M$ and that f_1 restricted to A is the identity. Extend f_1 to a homomorphism g of M; let $C = B_1 g$, $g_1 = g_{|B_1}$, and $g_2 = id_{|B_2}$.

(c) Build the countable HH structure M iteratively, supposing that $M_i \subset M$ has been constructed at step i.

At even i, use JEP to find structure M_{i+1} such that $A, M_i \subseteq M_{i+1}$, for all $A \in \mathcal{C}$.

At odd i, choose $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ with $A \subseteq B$. Apply MAP to extend each homomorphism $A \to M$ to a homomorphism $B \to M'$ for some $M' \supseteq M$. Successive application to each homomorphism $A \to M_i$ gives us a structure M_{i+1} such that each homomorphism $A \to M_{i+1}$ extends to a homomorphism $B \to M_{i+1}$. Arranging the steps so that every structure in $\mathcal{C}$ occurs at some even stage, and every pair (A, B) at infinitely many odd stages, we arrive at a countable structure with age $\mathcal{C}$ and having the HH property, and hence is HH. □

Call a class $\mathcal{C}$ satisfying part (c) of the theorem, a *homo-Fraïssé class*, and an HH structure with age $\mathcal{C}$ a *homo-limit* of $\mathcal{C}$. Unlike the usual form of Fraïssé's Theorem, a class having the homo-amalgamation property does *not* have a unique homo-limit, up to isomorphism; (the same is true of mono-amalgamation and mono-limit [**121**]). For example, there are many examples of graphs containing $\mathfrak{R}$ as a spanning subgraph whose age is the class of all finite graphs. However there is an equivalence relation which replaces isomorphism in our version of Fraïssé's Theorem. We call two structures M and M' *homo-equivalent* if

- $Age(M) = Age(M')$;
- every embedding of a finite substructure A of M into M' extends to a homomorphism from M to M', and the same with M and M' reversed.

9.8. Proposition. *(a) If M and M' are homo-equivalent structures and M is an HH structure, then M' is an HH structure.*

(b) Conversely, if M and M' are HH structures with $Age(M) = Age(M')$, then they are homo-equivalent.

PROOF. Assume the hypotheses and take $A, B \in Age(M)$ with $A \subseteq B$, and let $f : A \to M'$ be a homomorphism. Assume that $B \subseteq M$. Let A' be the image of f. Since $Age(M) = Age(M')$, there is a copy A'' in M, that is exists a homomorphism $\phi : A \to A''$ and an isomorphism $g : A'' \to A'$ such that $g \circ \phi = f$.

Since M has the HH property, ϕ extends to a homomorphism $\phi^* : M \to M$. Let $B'' = \phi^*(B)$. Also by assumption, the isomorphism g extends to a homomorphism $g^* : M \to M'$. Then $B_{|g^* \circ \phi^*}$ is a homomorphism $B \to M'$ extending f. So M' has the homo-extension property, and so is an HH structure.

(b) Suppose that M and M' are HH structures with the same age. If A is a finite substructure of M and $f : A \to M'$ is an embedding, for all $B \supseteq A$, by the homo-extension property in M' we can extend f to a homomorphism $B \to M'$. So there is a homomorphism $M \to M'$ extending f. □

(This proposition is a generalization of the result that a countable first-order structure $\mathcal{M}$ is $\aleph_0$-categorical if and only if $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ is oligomorphic [**90**, p.30].)

There is a partial order on the set of equivalence classes of an equivalence relation $M \leq_p M'$ between structures M and M' which holds if

- $Age(M') \subseteq Age(M)$; and
- any embedding of a finite substructure A into M' extends to a homomorphism from $M \to M'$.

Note the reverse ordering of ages; for example in the case of graphs containing $\mathfrak{R}$ as a spanning subgraph the more extra edges are added, the smaller the age. Part (a) of the last proposition shows that if M is HH and $M \leq_p M'$ then M' is also an HH structure.

Finally, we mention that the following is proved in [**121**]

9.9. PROPOSITION. *A countable graph Γ satisfies $\mathfrak{R} \leq_p \Gamma$ if and only if $\mathfrak{R}$ is a spanning subgraph of Γ.*

If M and M' are HH structures and $Age(M) \supseteq Age(M')$, it does not follow that $M \leq_p M'$. For example, if $M = \mathfrak{R}$ and M' is the disjoint union of two infinite complete graphs; the map taking a non-edge in M to a non-edge in M' clearly cannot be extended.

5. Topological HH Monoids

Oligomorphic permutation groups [**90**] were found to be a particularly interesting variety of infinite symmetric groups, due to the relative tameness of their properties as well as the connections with other fields, especially model theory. One such feature is that the group

can be studied in the form of its closure in the symmetric group in the topology of pointwise convergence. Thus we turn to characterizing closed (and in the next section oligomorphic) infinite monoids as a start to a more comprehensive study which could include finding monoids obeying primitivity and homogeneity properties and uncovering theorems on submonoids of closed monoids. It may even transpire that certain naturally defined oligomorphic monoids have links with combinatorial enumeration problems via interesting integer sequences that count orbits of monoid functions, as has arisen in the study of inverse semigroups of partial bijections on a finite set, or in oligomorphic group theory.

A way of representing closed monoids was given in [**121**], and we repeat it here.

For a countable set X, there is a natural topology on X^X, namely the product topology induced from the discrete topology on X . Thus the basic open sets are of the form

$$\{f \in X^X : f(x_i) = y_i \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, n\}, \qquad (\dagger)$$

where $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n \in X$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are distinct. Recall that in the induced topology on the symmetric group $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$, a permutation group G is closed if and only if it is the automorphism group of a homogeneous relational structure on X (see [**90**]). A similar observation holds for monoids:

9.10. Proposition. *(a) A submonoid S of X^X is closed in the product topology on X^X if and only if S is the monoid $End(\mathcal{M})$ of endomorphisms of an HH relational structure $\mathcal{M}$ on X.*

(b) A submonoid S of the monoid of one-to-one maps $X \to X$ is closed in the product topology if and only if S is the monoid of monomorphisms of an MM relational structure $\mathcal{M}$ on X.

Proof. (a) For each n, and each $\overline{x} \in X^n$, we take an n-ary relation $R_{\overline{x}}$ defined by

$$R_{\overline{x}}(\overline{y}) \Leftrightarrow (\exists s \in S)(\overline{y} = s(\overline{x})).$$

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the relational structure with relations $R_{\overline{x}}$ for all n-tuples $\overline{x}$ (and all n). We claim that S acts as endomorphisms of $\mathcal{M}$, that $\mathcal{M}$ is HH, and $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{M}) = S$.

For the first point, take $s \in S$ and $\overline{y} \in X^n$ such that $R_{\overline{x}}(\overline{y})$ holds; we must show that $R_{\overline{x}}(s(\overline{y}))$ holds. But $\overline{y} = s'(\overline{x})$ for some $s' \in S$; then $s(\overline{y}) = ss'(\overline{x})$, so the assertion is true.

Next, let f be a homomorphism between finite subsets of X, say $f(x_i) = y_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Let $\overline{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and $\overline{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)$.

Now S is a monoid and so contains the identity mapping. Thus, by definition, $R_{\overline{x}}(\overline{x})$ holds. Since f is a homomorphism, $R_{\overline{x}}(\overline{y})$ holds. So by definition, there exists $s \in S$ such that $s(\overline{x}) = \overline{y}$. Now s is an endomorphism of $\mathcal{M}$ extending f. So $\mathcal{M}$ is HH.

Finally, to show that $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{M}) = S$, we know already that $S \subseteq \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{M})$ and have to prove the reverse inclusion. We must take $h \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{M})$ and show that every basic neighbourhood of h contains an element of S, so that h is a limit point of S. Since S is assumed closed, we conclude that $h \in S$. Now each n-tuple $\overline{x}$ defines a basic neighbourhood of h, consisting of all functions k such that $k(\overline{x}) = h(\overline{x})$. Now $R_{\overline{x}}(\overline{x})$ holds; since h is a homomorphism, $R_{\overline{x}}(h(\overline{x}))$ also holds, and by definition of $R_{\overline{x}}$ this means that there exists $s \in S$ with $h(\overline{x}) = s(\overline{x})$, as required.

(b) The proof of this is entirely analogous, replacing homomorphisms by monomorphisms.

□

However the relational structures constructed in the proof of this proposition have infinitely many relations of each arity. We seek criteria that would enable us to recognize the monoids which are the endomorphism (or monomorphism) monoids of homogeneous structures with only finitely many relations of each arity (these would be the analogue of the closed oligomorphic permutation groups [**90**]), or even those with only finitely many relations altogether. In the following section we will return to this topic.

Consider the following characterisation of topological groups [**325**], repeated as Theorem A.46 in Appendix 10.

9.11. Theorem. *Let G be a topological group. Then $G = \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ for some countable structure M if and only if*

(a) *G is Hausdorff;*
(b) *G is complete;*
(c) *if $H < G$ is open then $|G : H| \leq \aleph_0$;*
(d) *there is a countable family $\{H_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of subgroups of G such that $\mathcal{B} = \{H_0^{g_0} \cap \ldots \cap H_k^{g_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}, g_0, \ldots, g_k \in G\}$ is a base of open subgroups of G, i.e. the set of cosets of elements of $\mathcal{B}$ forms a base for the topology on G.*

That is, a topological group is the automorphism group of a countable structure provided that the topology is complete and Hausdorff, and the family of open neighbourhoods of the identity has a countable base of open subgroups, each of which has index at most $\aleph_0$ in the automorphism group.

Open Question Much of group theory does not generalize in a straightforward way to monoids, but is there a analogue of this nice theorem characterizing topological monoids?

We can rule out one potential condition immediately; we do not want any compactness condition on the topology because then the topology would be locally compact, which itself is sufficient to rule out oligomorphic structures by the Engeler-Ryll-Nardzewski-Svenonius Theorem. Since compact implies complete implies closed, it seems reasonable to consider completeness. But in a complete metric space a subspace is complete if and only it it is closed. Further, if $\mathcal{M}$ is a first-order structure then $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{M})$ is closed; the converse is Proposition 9.10, that is, a submonoid of X^X is closed if and only if it is the endomorphism monoid of a first-order structure.

Take as basic open sets of the topology, translates of submonoids (that is composition with elements of the monoid) generated by the functions f given by (†) above. Each finite n-tuple of elements of the countable set X defines a basic neighbourhood of the function $f \in X^X$. Open sets are countable unions of these basic open sets.

The natural metric derived from the permutation topology on the symmetric group, that of pointwise convergence, is simpler in the case of monoids, as the metric derived from the topology is complete even in the absence of inverses. Suppose the operand is $\mathbb{N}$. A countable topology is metrizable via a distance function, so a sequence (m_n) of monoid maps where $m_n = f_0\ f_1\ f_2 \dots f_{n-1}$ is a Cauchy sequence for the metric d given by

$$d(m, m') = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m = m'; \\ \frac{1}{2^i} & \text{if } m \ \&\ m' \text{ agree on } \{0, \dots, i-1\} \text{ and disagree on } i \end{cases}$$

which begets the topology. In the case of permutation groups, this sequence would still be a Cauchy sequence but one that fails to converge, as illustrated by noting that the pointwise limit of permutations $\pi_n = (01 \dots n-1)$ is not a permutation, and so an extra relation for inverses is required [**90**]. However in the case of monoids, the limit still lies in the monoid. (Compare this with the fact [**13**] that the outer automorphism group of the quotient $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)/\mathrm{FSym}(\Omega)$ on a countably infinite set Ω is $\mathbb{Z}$). Any metric space is Hausdorff.

In the case of topological groups, each open subgroup is also closed, being the complement of a union of cosets of basic open sets; then choosing different basic open sets gives different topologies. If we are to assume the same applies in the case of monoids then by Proposition 9.10 we are forced to choose endomorphism monoids of HH relational structures.

For groups, the existence of an inverse ensures that cosets by a subgroup are disjoint and that there is a well-defined notion of index. For monoids, we can define $|M : S|$ to mean that M is the union of countably many right translates of S but the cosets are not disjoint.

As a prelude to the next section we make the following comments.

We know from the Upward Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem that if $\mathcal{M}$ is infinite, then its complete theory does not determine $\mathcal{M}$. (However, the automorphism groups of saturated structures can then be considered as invariants of the theory up to isomorphism; they are equal for bi-interpretable theories, see Appendix 10). The next best option is then to determine its model up to its cardinality. Given this, a complete theory is $\aleph_0$-categorical if it has a unique countable model up to isomorphism. $\aleph_0$-categoricity is proved using the back-and-forth method, and it is not clear that when we extend the theory from the actions of groups to those of monoids that we will be able to use any more than forth.

The back-and-forth argument, which can be traced back to Huntingdon [**300**] and then the book of Hausdorff [**273**] has been investigated, in particular with respect to the question of the sufficiency of going forth. Generally, back-and-forth works when we begin with an equivalence relation (or 'type') on n-tuples ($\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$), possibly chosen from different structures in some class, satisfying

($\diamond$) If $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}) = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{b})$ and x is any point of the structure $\mathcal{M}$ containing $\bar{a}$, then there is a point y in the structure $\mathcal{N}$ containing $\bar{b}$ such that $\mathrm{tp}(\bar{a}, x) = \mathrm{tp}(\bar{b}, y)$.

This guarantees both that all structures in the class are isomorphic and that tuples in a structure have the same type if and only if there is a type-preserving permutation of $\mathcal{M}$ which carries one to the other. Then 'types' are just orbits of a closed permutation group G of $\mathcal{M}$, and we can dispense with structure and logic and define types to be orbits of a closed permutation group on tuples of a set X, that is on $\bigcup_{n\geq 1} X^n$. These are the isomorphism or first-order types, and if a structure needs to be taken into account, they lie in the canonical structure for this group, satisfying ($\diamond$).

Say that *forth suffices* for G if the one-to-one type-preserving map from $X \to X$ is always onto, irrespective of the chosen enumerations, and that *forth suffices* for $\mathcal{M}$ if it suffices for its automorphism group.

Extend the usual definition of *suborbit* of G from finite permutation group theory to be a pair $(\bar{a}, A)$, where A is an orbit of the stabilizer of tuple $\bar{a}$. If $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{M}$ is $\aleph_0$-categorical, then A is a minimal

$\bar{a}$-definable set in $\mathcal{M}$.) The suborbit $(\bar{a}, A)$ is *trivial* if A is a singleton which is a member of $\bar{a}$. Say that $(\bar{b}, B)$ *dominates* $(\bar{a}, A)$ if

(i) each element of $\bar{a}$ occurs in $\bar{b}$;

(ii) $B \subseteq A$.

The suborbit $(\bar{a}, A)$ is *splittable* if there is a tuple $\bar{b}$ of points outside A such that $G_{\bar{a}\bar{b}}$ is intransitive on A, and *unsplittable* otherwise. Roughly, forth suffices if there are many unsplittable suborbits and vice versa.

If every non-trivial suborbit dominating a suborbit $(\bar{a}, A)$ is splittable then forth does not suffice.

Let G be a permutation group acting on a set X. The *algebraic closure* $\mathrm{acl}(A)$ of a finite subset $A \subset X$ is the set of all those points of X which lie in finite orbits of the pointwise stabilizer of A. If for every finite set, $\mathrm{acl}(X) = X$ and G has a primitive splittable suborbit then forth does not suffice. The random graph and Henson's graph $\mathfrak{H}_k$ are examples that fit this result.

Another example of an $\aleph_0$-categorical, homogeneous structure for which forth does not suffice is a countable dense ordered set without endpoints and with a distinguished dense subset whose complement is also dense. This structure is naturally associated with the stabilizer of a point in the countable homogeneous local order.

For a closed and countable permutation group on a set X, forth suffices [**90**, p.129]. The gap between the necessary condition and the sufficient condition for forth to suffice given in [**90**], has been narrowed by McLeish [**388**].

Extended discussions of this topic and its strong connection with Jordan groups can be found in [**90**] and [**325**].

6. Oligomorphic Monoids

The characterization of $\aleph_0$-categorical structures as given by the Engeler–Ryll-Nardzewski–Svenonius Theorem [**197**] [**468**] [**509**] would seem to be a one-off result of the form "axiomatizability = symmetry", applying to countable structures and not to those of higher cardinality. However there is a generalisation.

We begin the section with the work of D. Mašulović and M. Pech on homomorphism-homogeneous structures and oligomorphic transformation monoids [**385**]. We end with the theorem that Bodirsky and Pinsker have produced in [**51**] to characterize the endomorphism monoid of an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure.

There are several potential definitions of an oligomorphic monoid resulting from the fact that the "orbit relation" for a monoid is a preorder rather than an equivalence relation: it is reflexive and transitive but not necessarily symmetric. Given a preorder $\to$ on a set X, the relation $\equiv$ defined by $x \equiv y$ if $x \to y$ and $y \to x$ both hold is an equivalence relation; its equivalence classes are partially ordered by $\to$. Thus we have the following three conditions of increasing strength for a transformation monoid S on X:

(a) the orbit preorder on X^n has only finitely many connected components, for all n;

(b) the equivalence relation obtained from the orbit preorder on X^n has only finitely many classes, for all n;

(c) the invertible elements (permutations) in S form an oligomorphic permutation group on X.

There is an implication from (b) to (a) because each connected component of the orbit preorder contains one or more equivalence classes. The equivalence relation is given by $\vec{x} \equiv \vec{y}$ if and only if there exist $f, h \in S$ with $\vec{x}f = \vec{y}$ and $\vec{y}h = \vec{x}$; if $\vec{x}f = \vec{y}$ and f is invertible, then taking $h = f^{-1}$ this is satisfied, so (c) implies (b).

D. Mašulović and M. Pech [**385**] found the most natural definition, whereby homogeneneous or $\aleph_0$-categorical structures have as their analogues the class of countable homomorphism-homogeneous or countable *weakly oligomorphic structures*, to be defined below.

A structure is *homomorphism-homogeneous* if every homomorphism between finitely generated substructures of the structure extends to an endomorphism of the structure [**121**].

Let $\mathcal{R} = (R_i)_{i \in I}$ be a relational signature, and for an $\mathcal{R}$-formula $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and let $\mathcal{M} = \langle M, (R_i)_{i \in I}^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle$ be an $\mathcal{R}$-structure.

A transformation monoid $M \subseteq X^X$ is *oligomorphic* if the action of M on X^n has only finitely many orbits for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Just as the automorphism group of a homogeneous structure over a finite relational signature is oligomorphic, if $\mathcal{M}$ is a homomorphism-homogeneous structure over a finite relational language, then $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{M})$ is an oligomorphic transformation monoid.

The finiteness of the signature of $\mathcal{M}$ ensures that it has only finitely many n-element substructures for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each pair of integers m, k such that $m \geq k$ and each surjection $f : \{1, \ldots, m\} \to \{1, \ldots, k\}$ fix a right inverse f^* of f, that is, a mapping $f^* : \{1, \ldots, k\} \to \{1, \ldots, m\}$ satisfying $f \circ f^* = \mathrm{id}$. For example take $f^*(y) = \min(\, x : f(x) = y)$.

A signature $\mathcal{R}$ is *residually finite* in an $\mathcal{R}$-structure if $\mathcal{R}_k$ is finite for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ \exists l > n$ such that $\forall m \geq l$, every $k \leq n$, every

relation symbol $R \in \mathcal{R}_m$ and every surjective mapping $f : \{1, \dots, m\} \to \{1, \dots, k\}$ there is a relation symbol $R^f \in \mathcal{R}_k$ such that

$$\mathcal{M} \vDash \forall x_1 \dots x_m \Big(\big(\bigwedge_{(i,j) \in \ker(f)} x_i = x_j \big) \Rightarrow$$
$$\big(R^f(x_{f^*(1)}, \dots, x_{f^*(k)}) \Leftrightarrow R(x_1 \dots x_k) \big) \Big)$$

Every finite relational signature $\mathcal{R}$ is residually finite in every $\mathcal{R}$-structure. Also if $\mathcal{R}$ is residually finite in some $\mathcal{R}$-structure then $\mathcal{R}$ is countable. If $\mathcal{R}$ is a countable relational structure and $\mathcal{M}$ an $\mathcal{R}$-structure such that the signature $\mathcal{R}$ is residually finite in $\mathcal{M}$ then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there are, up to isomprphism, only finitely many n-element substructures of $\mathcal{M}$.

9.12. Theorem (Mašulović and M. Pech). *Let X be an infinite set and let $M \subseteq X^X$ be a transformation monoid. The following are equivalent:*

(1) M is closed in X^X and oligomorphic;

(2) There is a homomorphism-homogeneous $\mathcal{R}$-structure $\mathcal{M}$ on X for which $M = \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{M})$, where $\mathcal{R}$ is a countable relational signature which is residually finite in $\mathcal{M}$.

A relational structure $\mathcal{M}$ is *weakly oligomorphic*, if $\mathrm{End}(\mathcal{M})$ is an oligomorphic transformation monoid. Every relational structure with an oligomorphic automorphism group is weakly oligomorphic.

In order to state the oligomorphic monoid theorem equivalent to that of Engeler–Ryll-Nardzewski–Svenonius we need more definitions.

Let T be a first order theory in relational signature $\mathcal{R}$. Formulas $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\psi(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ are *equivalent in T*, written $\phi \equiv_T \psi$, if $T \vDash \forall \mathbf{x}(\phi(\mathbf{x}) \Leftrightarrow \psi(\mathbf{x}))$. Theory T is said to have the *positive Ryll-Nardzewski property* if for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there are only finitely many positive $\mathcal{R}$-formulas in variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$ which are pairwise inequivalent in T. An $\mathcal{R}$-structure $\mathcal{M}$ has this property if its first-order theory has it.

The *complete positive n-type* of an n-tuple $\mathbf{a} \in M^n$ in an $\mathcal{R}$-structure $\mathcal{M}$ is the set of all positive formulas that are satisfied by $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{M}$. An $\mathcal{R}$-structure $\mathcal{M}$ *realizes* a set of positive formulas $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ if there exists an n-tuple $\mathbf{x} \in M^n$ such that Φ is a subset of the complete positive n-type satisfied by $\mathbf{a}$. A *complete positive type of a complete theory T* is a complete positive type of a tuple of some model of T. Denote the set of all complete positive n-types of a theory T by $S_n^+(T)$.

A set of formulas $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ is *principal* with respect to T if there is a formula $\psi(\mathbf{x}) \in \Phi(\mathbf{x})$ such that $T \vDash \forall \mathbf{x}(\psi(\mathbf{x}) \Rightarrow \bigwedge \Phi(\mathbf{x}))$. We say that

ψ generates Φ. A first-order formula $\chi(\mathbf{x})$ is a *characteristic formula* for a set $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ of positive formulas with respect to T if $T \models \forall \mathbf{x}(\chi(\mathbf{x}) \Leftrightarrow \bigwedge \Phi(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \bigwedge \Phi^{\neg}(\mathbf{x}))$, where

$\Phi^{\neg}(\mathbf{x}) = \{\neg\psi(\mathbf{x})$is a positive formula and $\psi(\mathbf{x}) \notin \Phi(\mathbf{x})\}$.

9.13. Theorem (Mašulović and M. Pech). *Let T be a complete theory over a signature $\mathcal{R}$ and assume that T has infinite models. The following are equivalent:*

(1) Every countable model of T is weakly oligomorphic.

(2) There exists a countable model of T which is weakly oligomorphic.

(3) T has the positive Ryll-Nardzewski property.

(4) For every $n \geq 1$, every type in $S_n^+(T)$ has a characteristic formula.

(5) For every $n \geq 1$, every type in $S_n^+(T)$ is finite.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an $\mathcal{R}$-structure and let $\mathbf{a} \in A^n$. The *complete positive quantifier-free type* of $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ is the set of positive quantifier-free formulas that are satisfied by $\mathbf{a}$ in $\mathcal{A}$.

Mašulović and M. Pech also prove that an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure is both homogeneous and homomorphism-homogeneous if and only if it has quantifier elimination where every positive formula reduces to a positive quantifier-free formula.

We make some comments pertaining to random graphs. Let T be the first-order theory of graphs with the property that any finite set of vertices has a common neighbour. This requirement can be stated as a countable sequence of $(\forall\exists)$-sentences.

Firstly, any two countable models of T are mono-equivalent, for if $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are countable models, then "forth" gives a monomorphism from $\mathcal{M}$ into $\mathcal{N}$. Secondly, not every graph mono-equivalent to a model of T is a model of T; take, for example, the complete graph with an isolated vertex.

The countable models of T are precisely the graphs containing the random graph as a spanning subgraph; so they are all HH and MM. However, these are not "pure" monoid properties since they also involve the graphs.

The theory of graphs in which every finite set of vertices has a common neighbour has the property that all its countable models are *hom-equivalent* (that is, there exist homomorphisms in both directions between any two). Let T' be the first-order theory of graphs with the property that any finite clique has a common neighbour. Both T and T' are examples of first-order theories which are not $\aleph_0$-categorical

but for which all countable models are hom-equivalent. Theory T is an example of a first-order theory whose countable models are hom-equivalent but don't form a hom-equivalence class.

We turn to the general approach of Bodirsky and Pinsker.

An operation $f : V^n \to V$ is a *projection* if and only if there exists an $i \leq n$ such that $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = x_i$ for all $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in V$. A *clone* is a subset of the set of all finitary functions over a finite or infinite domain, which is closed under composition and containing all finitary projections - see also Chapter 11 and Appendix 9.

The topologically closed permutation groups, the closed transformation monoids, and the closed clones, containing $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ all form complete lattices. The atoms of these lattices are generated by functions on the random graph that are in a certain sense minimal. An operation is *minimal* if and only if it is non-trivial and all non-trivial functions g it generates have at least the arity of f and generate f. The trivial functions are the automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$ possibly with additional dummy variables. The group lattice has 5 atoms, corresponding to the 5 reducts of $\mathfrak{R}$ in Thomas' Theorem, whilst the other two lattices have infinite height.

The lattice of reducts modulo the equivalence whereby two reducts are equivalent if and only if they first-order define one another, is anti-isomorphic to the lattice of closed permutation groups containing $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$. The finer lattice of reducts up to *existential positive interdefinability* (see below), corresponds to the lattice of closed transformation monoids containing $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$. The lattice of reducts modulo the still finer equivalence of *primitive positive interdefinability* (see below), corresponds to the lattice of closed clones containing $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

The set of all clones over a domain forms a complete lattice with respect to set-theoretical inclusion, and also forms a smaller lattice of clones which are closed in the natural topology of pointwise convergence on the set $\mathcal{O}$ of all finitary operations on the domain closed under compositions and containing the projections. The countable basis of sets take the form

$$\mathcal{O}^s_A := \{f \in \mathcal{O} : f_{|A} = s\},$$

where for domain D, $A \subseteq D^n$ is finite and $s : A \to D$ is a finite function. The universal algebraic name for clones which are closed subsets of $\mathcal{O}$ in this topology are called *locally closed* or *local*. This is the equivalent for clones of closure for permutation groups.

A clone containing $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is an atom in the lattice of local clones containing $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ if and only if there exists a minimal operation f (defined in [**51**]) on $\mathfrak{R}$ such that the clone is the smallest local clone

containing the set $\{f\} \cup \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$, described as the local clone generated by $\{f\}$ over $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

Two structures M_1 and M_2 are *first-order interdefinable* when each is first-order definable in the other. Let $f : D^n \to D$ be an operation and let $R \subseteq D^m$ be a relation. We say that f *preserves* R if and only if $f(r_1, \ldots, r_n) \in R$ whenever $r_1, \ldots, r_n \in R$, where $f(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$ is calculated componentwise. One statement of the Engeler–Ryll-Nardzewski–Svenonius Theorem, is that a relation R is first-order definable in an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure M if and only if R is preserved by all automorphisms of M. It follows that the reducts of an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure are in 1–1 correspondence with the locally closed permutation groups containing $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$.

We need to define some concepts. A *polymorphism* of M is a homomorphism from a finite power M^n to M, or simply a finitary operation preserving all relations of M. A first-order formula is *existential* if and only if it is of the form $\exists x_1, \ldots, x_k \psi$, where ψ is quantifier-free. A first-order formula is *primitive positive* (respectively *existential positive*) if and only if it contains no negations, disjunctions and universal quantifications (and it is existential). As generalizations of the way that first-order definability characterizes automorphisms of an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure M, self-embeddings of an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure (respectively endomorphisms / polymorphisms) of M can be used to characterize existential definability (respectively existential positive definability / primitive positive definability).

Two structures M_1 and M_2 are *primitive positive interdefinable* if and only if every relation in M_1 has a definition by a primitive positive formula in M_2 and vice versa; analogously for existential positive and existential interdefinability. The following result is from [**49**]

9.14. Theorem. *A relation R is primitive positive definable in an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure M if and only if R is preserved by the polymorphisms of M.*

Finally we come to the theorem that describes existential and existential positive definability in an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure in terms of its endomorphism monoid.

9.15. Theorem (Bodirsky–Pinsker Theorem). *A relation R has an existential positive (existential) definition in an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure if and only if R is preserved by the endomorphisms (self-embeddings) of the structure.*

From this it follows that the study of closed transformation monoids containing $\mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{R})$ is equivalent to the study of reducts of $\mathfrak{R}$ up to existential positive interdefinability.

Open Question Classify the locally closed transformation monoids that contain $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

In [**50**], Bodirsky and Junker extend the Ahlbrandt–Ziegler analysis [**4**] of interpretability in $\aleph_0$-categorical structures by showing that the way that interpretability is controlled by the automorphism group has analogies, namely in the way that existential interpretation is controlled by the monoid of self-embeddings and positive existential interpretation of structures without constant endomorphisms is controlled by the monoid of endomorphisms.

Open Question F. Point and M. Prest proved in a study of the first-order theory of $\mathcal{R}$-modules over a ring $\mathcal{R}$ [**435**, Lemma 1.1], that there are forms of Morita equivalence that are special cases of the concept of interpretations in model theory; two generalizations are in [**450**] and [**451**]. Is there a version of the theorem of Bodirsky and Pinsker in this direction?

7. Appendix: Previous Results on Monoids Supported by $\mathfrak{R}$

We end the chapter by referencing some other publications that combine monoids and $\mathfrak{R}$.

Part of the interest has been in designing random graph models for the (world wide) web graph.

The *infinite locally random graph* is the graph limit obtained from iterating the following construction: given a graph Γ, for each vertex x and each subset X of its closed neighborhood, add a new vertex y whose neighbors are exactly X. Charbit and Scott have classified the infinitely many isomorphism classes of limit graph [**136**].

A semigroup S is *regular* if for all $f \in S$, there is a $g \in S$ such that $fgf = f$ and $gfg = g$. In [**61**], Bonato and Delić, investigated $\mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{R})$, showing that it is neither regular nor satisfies the property that: for each *singular* (that is, not onto) $f \in \mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$, $\exists n \geq 1$ such that f is the product of n idempotents, denoted $E(\mathrm{End}(\Gamma))$, of $\mathrm{End}(\Gamma)$. They also show that $\mathbb{Q}$ and in particular, every countable linear order, embeds in the set of idempotents in $\mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{R})$. Another result of this paper [**61**, Proposition. 4.2] is that for a graph Γ, there exists a retraction f of $\mathfrak{R}$ such that $\mathrm{im}(e) \cong \Gamma$ if and only if Γ is algebraically closed; they call a graph Γ *algebraically closed* if for each finite $S \subseteq V(\Gamma)$, there is a vertex $v \in V(\Gamma) \backslash S$ joined to all vertices from S. Here, $\mathrm{im}(e)$ is the induced subgraph of $\mathfrak{R}$ on the vertex set of $e(V(\mathfrak{R}))$.

In [**166**], Delić and Dolinka prove that End($\mathfrak{R}$) is not simple, but rather has uncountably many ideals.

The relation $f \leq g$ defined by $fg = gf = f$ is an order on $E(\mathrm{End}(\Gamma))$. Bonato proves [**57**] that this order is universal, that is it embeds every countable order, and by a refinement, every countable preorder also. This latter is constructed as follows: if $(A, \leq)$ is a preorder, then defining $x \sim y$ if $x \leq y$ and $y \leq x$, and writing the set of $\sim$-classes as $A/\sim$, gives an order $(A/\sim, \leq)$.

In [**65**], Bonato and Pralat define a core $H = Core(\Gamma(n, p(n)))$ of a random graph $\Gamma(n, p(n))$ *great* if for all $e \in E(H)$, there is a homomorphism from $H \backslash e$ to H that is not onto. For a large range of p they prove that with probability tending to 1 as $n \to \infty$, $\Gamma \in \Gamma(n, p(n))$ is a core that is not great.

The proof that End($\mathfrak{R}$) is universal as a monoid [**63**] utilizes a chain of graphs whose union is $\mathfrak{R}$. This extends to a chain of endomorphism monoids on those graphs that embeds End($\mathfrak{R}$), that is universally generates the full transformation monoid on a countable set.

Finally, Bonato proved [**58**] that for each finite core graph Γ, the class of all graphs admitting a homomorphism into Γ is a *pseudo-amalgamation class*, (see Appendix 4).

CHAPTER 10

Random Graph Constructions

.... the sole end of science is the honor of the human mind, and that under this title a question about numbers is worth as much as a question about the system of the world.

Carl Jacobi, *Quoted in N Rose Mathematical Maxims and Minims (Raleigh N C 1988)*

The cult of Vishnu has some frail links with Vedic mythology. He there appears as a solar god who traverses the three worlds in three steps.

New Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology

The connections between different parts of number theory and (random) graph theory in all likelihood lie in fertile ground (see for example Appendix 3. The first two sections of this chapter illustrate the use of reciprocity theorems and merely embellish the construction of $\mathfrak{R}$ given in [**103**]. This is followed by observations on constructions from elsewhere in mathematics.

1. A Number-Theoretic Construction of $\mathfrak{R}$

A particularly concise presentation of $\mathfrak{R}$ is the following [**55**]

$$\mathfrak{R} \cong \langle \omega, \{(i,j) : \text{the } i\text{th prime divides } j, \text{ or vice versa}\}\rangle.$$

In [**103**] a construction of $\mathfrak{R}$ is given using the original form of the quadratic reciprocity law due to Gauss. Here we give an original generalization showing that the construction works for a Gaussian algebraic number field $\mathbb{Q}[i]$.

Now to construct $\mathfrak{R}$. Take as vertex set $\mathbb{P}$ the set of all odd primes in $\mathbb{Z}$. Join prime p to prime q with an edge if $\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) = 1$. If $\mathbb{P}_1 = \{p \equiv 1(4)\}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{-1} = \{p \equiv -1(4)\}$, this would give the structure $\mathbb{P}_1 \cup \mathbb{P}_{-1}$ where $\mathbb{P}_1$ induces the random graph, $\mathbb{P}_{-1}$ induces the random tournament and $(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_{-1})$ is the random bipartite graph. In particular the partition into $\mathbb{P}_1$ and $\mathbb{P}_{-1}$ is visible in the graph, with $\mathbb{P}_{-1} = \{$vertices $v : \exists$ a directed

edge containing $v\}$. We get the same structures by taking the following vertex sets:

$$\mathbb{P}_1 \ = \ \textit{the set of primes which split in } \mathbb{Q}[i].$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{-1} \ = \ \textit{the set of primes which are inert in } \mathbb{Q}[i].$$

$$2 \ = \ \textit{the prime which ramifies in } \mathbb{Q}[i].$$

If we include 2 we find that there is an edge from $p \to 2$ for all p and that there is an edge from $2 \to p$ iff $p \equiv \pm 1(8)$. If we use a 2-adic version $p \to 2$ iff $p \equiv 1(4)$. Finally we get the following graph



The construction of this section reinforces that the primes of a Gaussian number field are randomly distributed.

The version of $\mathfrak{R}$ that is constructed using the Chinese Remainder Theorem and Dirichlet's Theorem [**103**] makes an unexpected appearance in Gareth Jones' classification of the regular embeddings of complete bipartite graphs in orientable surfaces [**314**]. Here is how it arises. Let $\to$ denote the binary relation on the set Π of all prime numbers defined by $q \to p$ if and only if q divides $p-1$. Regard Π as a directed graph, with an arc from q to p whenever $q \to p$. For each integer $n \geq 2$, let Π_n denote the induced subgraph of Π whose vertices are the prime factors $p_1, \ldots, p_l$ of n, formed by restricting the relation $\to$ to these primes. In Π there is an arc from the vertex 2 to every other vertex. Deleting this vertex and all incident arcs, and ignoring the direction of each remaining arc, we obtain an undirected graph Π' whose vertices are the odd primes and edges joining p and q if and only if q divides $p-1$ or vice versa. Jones proves that $\Pi' \cong \mathfrak{R}$.

2. A Number-Theoretic Construction of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$

This follows the same procedure as in the previous section, and uses the theory of cubic reciprocity, elements of which are summarized in Appendix 16.

Let U be a finite set of distinct cubic residues, and V', W' be two finite sets of distinct cubic non-residues. Define two sets by $V = \{\omega.v_j : v_j \in V'\}$ and $W = \{\omega^2.w_k : w_k \in W'\}$, where ω denotes a cube root of unity.

Now to construct $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. The vertex set is the set of primary elements of D. Join two such elements π_1 and π_2, with a

$$\begin{cases} \text{non-edge} & \text{if } \chi_{\pi_1}(\pi_2) = 1 \\ \text{single edge} & \text{if } \chi_{\pi_1}(\pi_2) = \omega \\ \text{double edge} & \text{if } \chi_{\pi_1}(\pi_2) = \omega^2, \end{cases}$$

where $\chi_{\pi_1}(\pi_2)$ is the cubic residue character of π_2 modulo π_1.

The symmetry of the edge-joining condition is given by by the statement of cubic reciprocity that can be found in Appendix 16. Let U, V, W be finite disjoint sets of primary ideals. Choose α_i such that $\chi_{u_i}(\alpha_i) = 1 \ \forall i$, β_j such that $\chi_{v_j}(\beta_j) = \omega \ \forall j$, and γ_k such that $\chi_{w_k}(\gamma_k) = \omega^2 \ \forall k$. That is, choose cubic residues $\alpha_i \pmod{u_i} \ \forall u_i \in U$ (for example $\alpha_i = 1$), cubic non-residues $\beta_j \pmod{v_j} \ \forall v_j \in V$, and cubic non-residues $\gamma_k \pmod{w_k} \ \forall w_k \in W$. The Chinese Remainder Theorem, of which there is a statement for general rings, implies that the congruences

$$\begin{aligned} z &\equiv \alpha_i \pmod{u_i} \ \forall u_i \in U \\ z &\equiv \beta_j \pmod{v_j} \ \forall v_j \in V \\ z &\equiv \gamma_k \pmod{w_k} \ \forall w_k \in W \\ z &\equiv 1 \pmod{3} \end{aligned}$$

have a unique solution $z \pmod{N}$, where $N = 3 \prod u_i \prod v_j \prod w_k$.

To capture the universality of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ we need to ensure an infinite supply of vertices z in the residue class. This is given to us by Dirichlet's Theorem which says that since $(z, N) = 1$, there are an arithmetical progression of primes of the form $z + kN$ $(k \in \mathbb{N})$. This theorem has far-reaching extensions, for example, to the Gaussian primes and to algebraic number fields; the Eisenstein integers form a commutative ring of algebraic integers in the algebraic number field $\mathbb{Q}\sqrt{(}-3)$. This construction gives a graph isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ if we follow the $(*_t)$ algorithm.

The construction of this section says that the primes in the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ of Eisenstein integers are randomly distributed.

3. Universal Metric Spaces and $\mathfrak{R}$

First we give an example of how to build $\mathfrak{R}$ from the points of a metric space.

10.1. THEOREM. *Let M be any countable, universal, homogeneous, integral metric space. Putting $x \sim y$ if and only if $d(x,y)$ is odd gives $\mathfrak{R}$.*

PROOF. Consider the process of adding a new point z with prescribed distances $d(z,a_i) = x_i$ from a given finite set of points $a_i, \ldots, a_n$. These distances satisfy

$$|x_i - x_j| \leq d(a_i,a_j) \leq x_i + x_j.$$

Assuming all x_i are large enough, for example at least the diameter of $\{a_i, \ldots, a_n\}$. The upper bound is definitely satisfied, and the lower bound says

$$x_i - d(a_i,a_j) \leq x_j \leq x_i + d(a_i,a_j).$$

The minimum value that d takes is 1, so given x_i there is always a range of at least 2 for the possible value of x_j, and we can choose its parity arbitrarily with $x_i \in \{m, m+1\}$ for some m. □

If we take the countable universal homogeneous *rational* metric space instead then we can also construct the random graph, for example by partitioning the positive rationals into dense subsets A, B and putting $x \sim y$ if and only if $d(x,y) \in A$ [**129**].

The metric space equivalent of the random graph is uniquely defined by a one-point extension property as it is for random graphs. Some connections between metric spaces and random graphs are studied in [**103**, §3.7], where metric space constructions are given for $\mathfrak{R}$, the almost-homogeneous random bipartite graph $\mathfrak{B}$ and Henson's graph $\mathfrak{H}_k$. As pointed out in [**114**], thinking of the edge-set of a simple graph on a given countable vertex set as a countable zero-one sequence, leads to the fact that the class of graphs forms a complete metric space, of which the subclass of graphs satisfying the two-colour *I-property* is a residual subset.

A metric space X is called a *(generalized) Urysohn space* [**534**] if whenever $A \subseteq X$ is a finite metric subspace of X and $A' = A \cup \{a\}$ is an arbitrary one-point metric space extension of A, the embedding $A \hookrightarrow X$ extends to an isometric embedding $A' \hookrightarrow X$. Up to isometry there is only one universal complete separable Urysohn metric space, denote it $\mathfrak{U}$, which contains an isometric copy of every separable metric space. Because there are an uncountable number of two-point isometric

spaces let alone larger spaces, in order to construct a countable universal metric space as a Fraïssé limit of the class of finite metric spaces, we need to impose some extra condition on distances otherwise there are too many spaces (there are uncountably many two-point spaces up to isometry). There is a unique countable universal rational metric space denoted $\mathbb{QU}$ having all distances in $\mathbb{Q}$, with $\mathfrak{U}$ being its completion. The space $\mathfrak{U}$ is connected and locally connected and furthermore it is *homogeneous*: every isometry between two finite subspaces of X extends to an isometry of $\mathfrak{U}$ to itself; the same is true if we replace finite by compact. The group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{U})$ is highly transitive on isometry classes of finite subspaces, just as $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is transitive on the set of isomorphic finite subgraphs. By comparison the Banach space $C[0,1]$ is universal but not homogeneous, whilst both the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and the unit sphere in $\mathcal{H}$ are homogeneous. The infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces play the role of Urysohn metric spaces for the class of metric spaces embeddable into Hilbert spaces.

The way to show that $\mathfrak{U}$ is the 'Random Polish Space' is to choose n-tuples of random real numbers as distances from n-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, take a measure for each dimension, and construct a countable space one point at a time using a suitable measure on extensions via a 'random metric' between the $(n+1)^{\mathrm{st}}$ point and the first n points, ensuring that the triangle inequality which determines a cone in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is satisfied each time. Finally take the completion of this. We can say more precisely what a random metric on $\mathbb{N}$ looks like. Let a_0, a_1 be the first two points of the space. Choose $d(a_0,a_1) = x_0^{(1)} \geq 0$, to lie in $\mathbb{R}^+$, where the superscript denotes dimension. Next, choose a_2 so that $d(a_0,a_2) = x_0^{(2)} = x \geq 0$ and $d(a_1,a_2) = x_1^{(2)} = y \geq 0$ satisfying

$$|x-y| \leq x_0^{(1)} \leq x+y.$$

Now choose a_3 so that $d(a_0,a_3) = x_0^{(3)} = z_1 \geq 0$, $d(a_1,a_3) = x_1^{(3)} = z_2 \geq 0$ and $d(a_2,a_3) = x_2^{(3)} = z_3 \geq 0$ satisfying several inequalities of the form

$$|z_1 - z_2| \leq x_0^{(2)} \leq z_1 + z_2.$$

Each cone at each new dimension depends on the previous one. By choosing a wide range of reasonable measures on all cones, the completion of $\mathbb{N}$ equipped with a random metric is almost always isometric to $\mathfrak{U}$. A. Vershik [**538**] attaches admissible vectors to distance matrices in order to mimic the one-point extension property. The indivisibility property of $\mathfrak{U}$ whereby if $B \subset \mathfrak{U}$ is an open ball then $\mathfrak{U}\backslash B \cong \mathfrak{U}$ is equivalent to removing a row and some columns in the distance matrices stabilizes $\mathfrak{U}$.

It is possible to construct $\mathfrak{R}$ from $\mathfrak{U}$. An integer-valued construction of $\mathfrak{U}$ is given in [**103**, Theorem 3.11]. Any group acting on $\mathfrak{U}$ with a countable dense orbit preserves the structure of $\mathfrak{R}$ on the dense orbit [**129**, Proposition 7]. Urysohn space is generic with respect to Baire category, that is the class of Urysohn spaces is residual in the class of all Polish spaces.

The homogeneity of $\mathfrak{U}$ implies that it is also $\aleph_0$-categorical, because it is defined over a finite relational language [**379**]. Then by the Engeler-Ryll-Nardzewski-Svenonius Theorem, the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{U})$ is transitive on all isometric n-tuples because such a group can only have finitely many congruences. However within this constraint, every Polish metric space is isometric to the set $\mathrm{fix}(g)$ of fixed points of some $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{U})$, so conjugacy in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{U})$ is as complicated as it can be. If $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{U})$ is such that all its orbits are totally bounded then $\mathrm{fix}(g)$ is isometric to $\mathfrak{U}$.

If a metric space is separable, and therefore second-countable, then so is its automorphism group. Both $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{U})$ and $\mathrm{BdAut}(\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{U})$ (the group of all *bounded* isometries) have been proven to be dense in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{U})$ [**129**]. Also $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{U}) < \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$; in fact it is shown in [**129**] that there are $2^{\aleph_0}$ different reducts all of which are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$. As $\mathfrak{U}$ is uncountable, any study of reducts should be restricted to $\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{U}$.

Macpherson has proved [**372**] that any closed oligomorphic subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ contains a free subgroup of infinite rank; this includes both $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{U})$ and the group $\mathrm{Iso}(\mathfrak{U})$ of isometries of the Urysohn space, into which $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{U})$ embeds densely.

Urysohn proved that there is no isometry of $\mathfrak{U}$ mapping *infinite* subspaces to each other and Trofimov proved that there is no isomtery of $\mathfrak{U}$ mapping two arbitrary *countable* subsets to each other [**526**].

In [**539**] Vershik proves the equivalence of the fact that $\mathrm{Iso}(\mathfrak{U})$ contains an everywhere dense locally finite subgroup with the the generalization of Hrushovski's theorem (see also the work of Herwig and Lascar [**276**] [**277**]) regarding the globalization of the partial isomorphisms of finite graphs [**292**] to metric spaces, namely that, for each finite metric space X there exists another finite metric space $\overline{X}$ and isometric embedding i of X into $\overline{X}$ such that isometry i induces the embedding of the group monomorphism of $\mathrm{Iso}(X)$ to $\mathrm{Iso}(\overline{X})$ and each partial isometry of X (that is, isometry between two subsets of X) can be extended to a global isometry of $\mathrm{Iso}(X)$. He also proves the following strengthening of homogeneity

10.2. THEOREM. *For any finite subset $X \subset \mathbb{QU}$ there exists an isomorphic embedding $j : \mathrm{Iso}(X) \to \mathrm{Iso}(\mathbb{QU})$ such that $(jg)(x) = g(x)$ for all $g \in \mathrm{Iso}(X), x \in X$. Consequently, the space $\mathbb{QU}$ is a countable union of finite orbits of the group $j\,\mathrm{Iso}(X)$.*

It follows that each finite metric space or Polish space can be embedded equivariantly into $\mathfrak{U}$. Vershik goes on to remark that for graphs the words 'random' and 'universal' coincide despite the randomness in question not referring to one graph but indicative of the measure on the set of all graphs, but for continuous spaces the issue is more subtle and the role of a specific choice of measure is essential.

M. Doucha has constructed an abelian separable invariant metric group G that is universal and homogeneous; that is, every separable abelian topological group equipped with an invariant compatible metric can be isometrically embedded into G, and any isometric homomorphism between two finitely generated subgroups of G extends to an isometric automorphism of G. In particular, for every abelian Polish group there is a topologically isomorphic closed subgroup of G. The construction is related to work of Cameron and Vershik imposing an abelian group structure on Urysohn space. Some more of Doucha's results on universal homogeneous Polish metric structures can be found in [**182**].

Further properties of $\mathbb{QU}$ are discussed in [**114**] and [**129**]; a construction of the rational Urysohn space is given in [**296**]. See also the workshop proceedings on Urysohn space edited by A. Leiderman et al [**353**]. Separable and non-separable universal metric spaces are studied from a different viewpoint in the monograph [**362**].

4. Homogeneous Integral Metric Spaces

Accounts of Cameron's previous work on homogeneous integral metric spaces is given in [**103**] and [**106**].

The unique countable homogeneous integral metric space M_N of diameter N is the same as the unique countable distance-homogeneous graph of diameter N that has arisen in the work of Lawrence S. Moss, so we give a synopsis of his relevant work on universal graphs of finite diameter, and then give a theorem that begins a classification of integral metric spaces.

In a graph Γ, denote the shortest length-N path from x to y by $d_\Gamma(x, y) = N$, where an infinite length means that x and y belong to different connected components of Γ. An isometric embedding between graphs is a distance-preserving map. If $\overline{x}$ (resp. $\overline{y}$) is a length-k path in Γ_1 (resp. Γ_2), write $\overline{x} =_N \overline{y}$ to mean that whenever $1 \le i, j \le k$ and

either $d_{\Gamma_1}(x_i, x_j) \leq N$ or $d_{\Gamma_2}(y_i, y_j) \leq N$, then $d_{\Gamma_1}(x_i, x_j) = d_{\Gamma_2}(y_i, y_j)$. An isometric embedding of graphs is a stronger condition than an isomorphic embedding. A graph Γ is *distance-homogeneous* [**403**] if for every pair of tuples $\overline{x}$ and $\overline{y}$ of the same length such that $\overline{x} =_\infty \overline{y}$ there is a $g \in \Gamma : \overline{y} = \overline{x}g$.

In [**401**] [**402**] Moss showed that for each natural number N there is a countable graph $\mathfrak{R}_N$ of diameter N and into which there is an isometric embedding of every countable graph of diameter N. So, $\mathfrak{R}_0$ is a single vertex, $\mathfrak{R}_1$ is the complete graph on infinitely many vertices, and $\mathfrak{R}_2$ is the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$. So the graphs $\mathfrak{R}_N$ are in a sense higher-dimensional analogues of $\mathfrak{R}$. Each graph $\mathfrak{R}_N$ is the unique countable distance-homogeneous graph of diameter N which isometrically embeds every countable diameter-N graph. There is a universal countable connected graph $\mathfrak{R}_\infty$ first studied by Pach [**425**] and rediscovered in [**403**] into which every countable connected graph is embedded. Whilst the $\mathfrak{R}_N$ do not sit in each other in any obvious way and so there is no way of arbitrarily taking unions, in terms of the first-order theories of these graphs,

$$\mathrm{Th}(\mathfrak{R}_\infty) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \mathrm{Th}(\mathfrak{R}_N).$$

In other words, the first-order theory of the unique countable distance homogeneous countable graph which isometrically embeds every countable graph is the model completion of the theory of distanced graphs. A first-order sentence is satisfied by $\mathfrak{R}_\infty$ if and only if it is satisfied by $\mathfrak{R}_N$ for almost all N. There is one countable connected model but more than one uncountable model.

Corresponding to the $(*)$-condition for $\mathfrak{R}$, there are two equivalent characterizations of $\mathfrak{R}_N$, as follows. The graph $\mathfrak{R}_N$ is the unique countable graph with the following property:

$(*_N)$ Let $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_{N-1}$ and V be finite disjoint sets of vertices of $\mathfrak{R}_N$. Suppose that whenever $1 \leq i \leq j \leq N-1$, $x \in U_i$ and $y \in U_j$, we have that $j - i \leq d_{\mathfrak{R}_N}(x, y) \leq j + i$. Also, whenever $1 \leq i \leq N-1$, $x \in U_i$ and $y \in V$ we have that $N - i \leq d_{\mathfrak{R}_N}(x, y)$. Then there exists in $z \in \mathfrak{R}_N$ such that (a) for all $i \leq N$ and all $x \in U_i, d_{\mathfrak{R}_N}(x, z) = i$; and (b) for all $y \in V$, and all $d_{\mathfrak{R}_N}(y, z) \geq N$,

or equivalently

$(*_N)$ Let $\overline{x}$ and $\overline{y}$ be k-tuples from $\mathfrak{R}_N$ and Γ respectively, where $k \in \omega$ and Γ are arbitrary, and suppose that $\overline{x} =_{2(N-1)} \overline{y}$. Then $\forall y_1 \in \Gamma, \exists x_1 \in \mathfrak{R}_N$ such that $\overline{x}, x_1 =_{N-1} \overline{y}, y_1$.

Every countable connected graph can be embedded into $\mathfrak{R}_\infty$ in $2^{\aleph_0}$ ways and $\mathfrak{R}_\infty$ has $2^{\aleph_0}$ many automorphisms. A countable collection

of copies of $\mathfrak{R}_\infty$ is the unique distance-homogeneous countably universal graph. The finite distance-homogeneous graphs have been classified [**80**] and found to be precisely those graphs with the property that for every pair of 6-tuples $\overline{x}$ and $\overline{y}$ such that $\overline{x} =_\infty \overline{y}$, there is a graph automorphism taking $\overline{x}$ to $\overline{y}$ pointwise.

Whilst the existence of universal countable graphs under isometric embeddings does not follow from general model theory, there are characterizations related to the concept of existentially closed structures [**403**] (see Appendix 9).

Finally, consider a graph Γ with the following I-property (I_P)

(I_P) If whenever A and B are connected graphs with $|A| \leq P$ and $|B| = |A| + 1$, and $i : A \to \Gamma$ and $j : A \to B$ are isometric embeddings, then there is an isometric embedding $k : B \to \Gamma$ such that $k \circ j = i$.

The Johnson graph $J(n, m)$ has vertices the m-subsets of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, and two vertices connected if and only if their intersection has size $m-1$. In [**404**], Moss and Dabrowski show that the Johnson graphs $J(n, 3)$ satisfy (I_3) whenever $n \geq 6$, and that $J(6, 3)$ is the smallest graph satisfying (I_3).

We say that a graph Γ has the I-property (LI_P) if for all $v \in \Gamma$, the subgraph $\Gamma(v)$ induced by the neighbours of Γ has property (I_P). The Johnson graphs $J(n, m)$ are locally gridlike, and so do not satisfy (LI_P), but $\mathfrak{R}$ and $\mathfrak{R}_\infty$ satisfy (I_3) and (LI_P) for all P.

Next we turn to reducts of integral metric spaces. We can show that, in the universal homogeneous metric space of diameter n, the "distance at most k" graph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ if and only if $k + 1 \leq n \leq 2k$. More generally, we can find necessary and sufficient conditions for a reduct of M_n to be isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$.

Let M_n be the unique countable homogeneous integral metric space of diameter n. Thus, M_2 is the vertex set of the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ with the path metric.

10.3. THEOREM. *Let $\{1, \ldots, n\} = A \cup B$, where $A \cap B = \varnothing$. Form a graph Γ on the vertex set M_n, by joining x and y if and only if $d(x, y) \in A$. Then $\Gamma \cong \mathfrak{R}$ if and only if $\{\lceil n/2 \rceil, \ldots, n\} \notin A$ and $\{\lceil n/2 \rceil, \ldots, n\} \notin B$.*

PROOF. Since $\mathfrak{R}$ is self-complementary, we can interchange A and B where necessary.

Suppose first that $\{\lceil n/2 \rceil, \ldots, n\} \subseteq B$. Then edges join points at distance less than $n/2$; so Γ has diameter greater than 2, and cannot be isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$.

Now suppose that $\{\lceil n/2 \rceil, \ldots, n\}$ is not contained in either A or B. We may suppose that $n \in B$. Let a be the maximal element of A; so

$a > n/2$, and $a+1 \in B$. Let U and V be finite disjoint sets of points of M_n. We seek a point z such that $d(z,u) = a$ for all $u \in U$, and $d(z,v) = a+1$ for all $v \in V$. These requirements are consistent. For the consistency conditions (instances of the triangle inequality) are

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \le d(u_1,u_2) \le 2a &\quad \text{for} \quad u_1,u_2 \in U, \\ 1 \le d(u,v) \le 2a+1 &\quad \text{for} \quad u \in U, v \in V, \\ 0 \le d(v_1,v_2) \le 2a+2 &\quad \text{for} \quad v_1,v_2 \in V. \end{aligned}$$

These are satisfied since $2a \ge n$. So by the properties of M_n, the point z exists. Now by construction z is joined to U for all $u \in U$, and not joined to v for all $v \in V$. Thus, Γ satisfies the well-known characterisation of $\mathfrak{R}$. □

10.4. Corollary. *The graph obtained from M_n by joining points at distance at most k is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ if and only if $k+1 \le n \le 2k$.*

The model of $\mathfrak{R}$ is a submodel of the model of M_n, so $\mathrm{Aut}(M_n) \le \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$, so the $\mathfrak{R}$-reducts lie between $\mathrm{Aut}(M_n)$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(M_n)$.

How many of the reducts of M_k are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$? Note that these will also be reducts of M_n. A space M_k is a reduct of M_n when it is possible to divide n-distances into k classes such that you get a reduct isomorphic to M_k.

Which other reducts of M_k for $k \ge 3$ are also reducts of M_n? We need to search for higher-order relations on the points of M_k. For M_3, we require non-oriented ternary relations on triples of points.

Let $A \subseteq M_n$ be a subset of points having only odd distances. We need to consider triangles in which the perimeter is odd. Given a subset A, what is the graph got by taking distances in A to be proper reducts of the original metric space? What is the two-graph?

There are two-graph-like conditions on triples directly derivable from the metric space that are not reducts of $\mathfrak{R}$. Let $\{1,\ldots,n\} = A \cup A^c$, where A^c denotes the complement of A in the n-set. Assume a ternary relation (x,y,z) on M_n if and only if there are an odd number of the distances in A. The ternary relation defines a two-graph on triples of M_n if and only if all of the odd distances chosen belong to A, and $\{\lceil n/2\rceil,\ldots,n\} \notin A$ and $\{\lceil n/2\rceil,\ldots,n\} \notin A^c$; this is the same as the two-graph on vertices of $\mathfrak{R}$. However, with these criteria on A and A^c, if one of the odd distances lies in $\{\lceil n/2\rceil,\ldots,n\}$ then the ternary structure on triples of M_n-points is no longer a two-graph; call it a T-*structure*. (This is not to be confused with a different ternary relational construct called a T-structure that appears in [**90**, p. 68], which is associated with tournaments.) We must prove that a T-structure is a reduct of

M_n. Clearly, each automorphism of M_n is also an automorphism of the T-structure, so that $\mathrm{Aut}(M_n) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathsf{T})$, so it remains to show that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathsf{T})$ is closed, and we leave this as an open question for further work.

Open Question Classify the reducts of integral metric spaces.
(see Appendix A.2).

5. Miscellaneous Observations

1. There is a method of building $\aleph_0$-categorical structures with a countably infinite domain by using finite substructures. If N is a finite substructure of a homogeneous structure M, then all automorphisms of N extend to automorphisms of M fixing N; so two tuples lying in the same orbit of $\mathrm{Aut}(N)$ also lie in the same orbit of $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$. If the converse holds we say that N is a *finite homogeneous substructure* of M. So a finite homogeneous substructure is itself a homogeneous structure. Call M *smoothly approximable* if it is the union of a chain of finite homogeneous substructures of itself. The canonical example of a smoothly approximable structure is a projective space of countable dimension over a finite field, which is the union of a chain of finite-dimensional subspaces. Kantor, Liebeck and Macpherson classified [**322**] $\aleph_0$-categorical smoothly approximable structure with primitive and oligomorphic automorphism groups. Hrushovski showed [**294**] that the assumption of primitivity is not necessary. Smoothly approximable structures are further studied in [**140**]. The random bipartite graph $\mathfrak{B}$ provides an example of a primitive $\aleph_0$-categorical permutation structure that is not smoothly approximable [**322**, p. 457].

2. We make one final observation about metric space theory with [**103**, § 3.7] and [**74**, pp.232-234] in mind. If we take a random graph of diameter at most 2, and we assign distances between vertices u, v as follows:

$$d(u,v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u = v \\ 1 & \text{if } u \sim v \\ 2 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then the distance-1 graph will be an integral metric space. Clearly, by inspection, this construction *cannot distinguish* between $\mathfrak{R}$, $\mathfrak{R}^t$ or any of the higher-adjacency random graphs, because all distances are ≤ 2 regardless of the adjacency. This shortcoming can be overcome by introducing a theory of coloured metric spaces, in which all distances have an upper bound, but two points are adjacent if and only if their distance apart lies within the requisite upper bound and is monochromatic. This would give us as many different monochromatic random

graphs as there are colours. Another possible way of overcoming the obstacle to modeling the higher-adjacency random graphs is to utilise the language of algebraic topology as is done in [**103**, p.60].

3. The proof given in [**103**] that the injectivity property for the random graph holds for the set-theoretic construction of $\mathfrak{R}$ relies fundamentally on the axiom of foundation (AF) not being violated. A natural question arises as to whether or not the result goes through for $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ with an extension to the anti-foundation Axiom (AFA). This axiom is a prerequisite for the existence of sets with $\in$ symmetrised, which would be required if in addition to the edge or non-edge possibilities, we were to take the third adjacency type to be a double edge, or set theoretically to demand both $x \in y$ and $y \in x$.

There is a loop version of the *I-property* defining $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ whereby an extra vertex with a loop, say z^l, must be found at each iteration. To demonstrate that this property $(*_{t,l})$ does *not* yield all possible anti-founded sets, let U, V, W be finite disjoint sets of sets, and take

$$z = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p, w_1, \ldots, w_r, x_1, \ldots, x_q\}$$

where $x_j \notin \bigcup v_j, x_j \notin \{v_1, \ldots, v_q\}$ for $(j = 1, \ldots, q)$, and

$$z^l = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p, w_1, \ldots, w_r, y_1, \ldots, y_q, z^l\}$$

where $y_j \notin \bigcup\bigcup v_j, y_j \notin \bigcup v_j, y_j \notin \{v_1, \ldots, v_q\}$ for $(j = 1, \ldots, q)$.

Consider vertex z. Certainly all members of U and W are in z if we consider all such zs. Suppose $\exists v \in V$ joined to z. Then either $v \in z$; whence $v \in \{u_1, \ldots, u_p\}$ or $v \in \{w_1, \ldots, w_r\}$ (both of which contradict our disjointness assumption), whilst $v \in x_j \notin \bigcup v_i$ is also a contradiction. Or, $z \in v$ implying the contradiction $x_j \in v$, for $x_j \notin \{v_1, \ldots, v_q\}$, that is taking $v = v_j$ gives the contradiction $x_j \in \bigcup v_j$.

Now consider vertex z^l. Then $z^l \in v$ implies $y_j \in z^l \in v$, contradicting $y_j \notin \bigcup v_j$. Also $y_j \in z^l \in z^l \in v$ contradicts $y_j \notin \bigcup\bigcup v_j$. Similarly $v \in z^l$ would imply $v \in y_j \notin \{v_1, \ldots, v_q\}$. However now we come to the crux of the matter. Whilst $w_k \in z$ for all k, by assumption $w_1 \cap w_2 = \varnothing$, so there is no z for which $z \in w_1$ *and* $z \in w_2$.

This example firstly shows that by weakening FA to AFA we are no longer able to satisfy $(*_{t,l})$, and in fact that AF is needed to verify $(*_{t,l})$. Secondly the set-theoretic version of the defining condition for the triality graph is too strong to allow all possible graphical representations of all anti-founded sets, and we cannot contend that ZFA is the theory of orientations of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ in the way that ZF is the theory of orientations of $\mathfrak{R}$ [**103**]. There are now several questions that can be asked. Suppose we take a specific form of an anti-foundation axiom (as Barwise and Moss do in [**33**]). Now given a countable model of ZFA

with this axiom, we get a graph by symmetrizing $\in$ in that model. Is the graph unique (up to isomorphism)? If so, how can it be described? If not, how many different graphs can arise thus?

Another way to proceed is to try to construct a universal structure. For example, take unary relations $W_0, W_1, W_2, \ldots$ where W_i consists of i vertices doubly connected to a certain z, and insist that for all vertices, only one of the W_i holds. Does this give a universal structure? Even so it may not be homogeneous and amalgamation may fail. So can we add further relations to ensure that we get a Fraïssé limit?

We make some further set-theoretic remarks.

(1) We can demonstrate simply the existence of random graphs of arbitrarily large infinite cardinality, noting however that identifying a canonical model of one, even with $\aleph_1$ vertices is not necessarily straightforward. Recall that every ordinal number $\alpha > 0$ that is less than the smallest ordinal ϵ such that $\epsilon = \omega^\epsilon$ has a unique expansion in terms of a decreasing finite sequence of ordinals $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$\alpha = \omega^{\alpha_1} + \omega^{\alpha_2} + \ldots + \omega^{\alpha_k}.$$

Now consider the base 2 expansion of this so-called Cantor Normal Form of α. Take all ordinals having such an expression (hereditarily) less than ω_α for some α. Label the vertices of Rado's construction of the random graph [**103**] with ordinals $\alpha, \beta, \ldots$. Join vertex β to vertex α (with $\beta < \alpha$ as ordinals) if and only if 2^β appears in the α-expansion. Now, for any finite disjoint sets of numbers U and V, we can add vertices to U in order to achieve $max(U) > max(V)$. Then defining $z := \sum_{u \in |\alpha|} 2^u$ ensures that z is joined to every vertex in U and to no vertex in V. In view of this being an extension of Rado's dyadic construction [**453**], there is a sense in which random graphs constructed in this way could be considered to be the canonical versions of higher infinite cardinality.

(2) The *axiom of universality* (that every extensional graph has an injective decoration) is incompatible with the anti-foundation axiom (stating that every graph has a unique decoration), as the former yields many more non-well-founded sets; for example, it implies the existence of collections of reflexive sets (of the form $x = \{x\}$) of arbitrary cardinality. Point (1) above indicates a constructive existence proof of such collections if the vertices z are chosen to have loops. Notice that $\omega = 2^\omega (= n^\omega)$, giving $\omega = \{\omega\}$ for vertex ω. Any vertex z with a loop can be defined so that $z = 2^z$. *Epsilon numbers* are ordinals ϵ such

that $\epsilon = \omega^\epsilon$ but may also be defined as ordinals $\epsilon > \omega$ such that $2^\epsilon = \epsilon$. The smallest ordinal satisfying the equation $\omega^\alpha = \alpha$ is $\alpha = \epsilon_0$, and so is the limit of the sequence $0, 1, \omega, \omega^\omega, \omega^{\omega^\omega}, \ldots$. Since the class of epsilon numbers is of equicardinality with the class of ordinals, we can find as many vertices ϵ_α such that $\epsilon_\alpha = \{\epsilon_\alpha\}$ as there are ordinals α.

(3) There is a generalization of the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ in another direction, to greater than the one dimension of $\mathfrak{R}$. This is done by imagining an n-dimensional space, where each dimension has a coordinate with a dyadic expansion as per Rado's. This transports us into the realm of *simplicial complexes*. These are natural generalizations of graphs; the first-order language L_d of d-complexes resembles that of graphs, except that in place of the adjacency predicate $\sim$, it has d predicates $\sim_1, \ldots, \sim_d$, where $\sim_i$ is an $(i+1)$-place predicate. The *dimension* of a simplex is one less than its cardinality, and a d-dimensional simplex reduces to a graph when $d = 1$. It has been shown [**48**] that every property of d-complexes expressible by an L_d-sentence holds of almost all or almost no d-complexes, just as it does for graphs. In fact Rado's original paper [**453**] has a result on universal simplicial complexes.

4. Throughout this work we have assumed that the background set theory is ZF. Another possibility is to work within a set theory in which the axiom of choice is false. This allows us to define so-called *amorphous sets* [**532**]. A set is said to be *amorphous* if it is infinite but is not the disjoint union of two infinite sets. This differs from the pigeonhole property obeyed by the countable homogeneous graphs that we have been studying, but amorphous sets appear to have some 'pigeonhole-like' property: given any partition into two parts, one is finite and the other is amorphous. In particular no countably infinite set can be amorphous and so no countably infinite structure, in particular $\mathfrak{R}$, can be built from such a set. An equally immediate way to see that we cannot construct the countably infinite random graph using an amorphous vertex set is to observe that one of the cycle types realized by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ has two infinite cycles and one fixed point (that is $\aleph_0^2.1^1$), which cannot be realized by any permutation group acting on an amorphous set. A more instructive argument runs as follows. For a set Ω, the canonical relational structure $\mathcal{M}$ for a certain permutation group G acting on Ω is such that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ is the closure of G in $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$. The *age* of a relational structure $\mathcal{M}$ on Ω is the class of all finite structures embeddable in $\mathcal{M}$ as induced substructures. Regarding $\mathrm{Age}(\mathcal{M})$ as a

tree with nodes in $\mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ be the set of infinite paths from the root. For any relational structure we can turn $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ into a complete metric space by defining a metric on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$. But if the domain of the structure is an amorphous set, two-way infinite paths are forbidden, and a metric cannot be defined for the whole space, only a 'partial' metric for finite paths. Equally, we cannot apply Baire category theory, because we do not have residual sets, that is those that contain an intersection of countably many dense open sets, because the complement would be a union of countably many closed dense sets. Because the set of graphs on vertex set $\mathbb{N}$ which are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ is residual in $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{R})$, an amorphous set cannot be the domain of $\mathfrak{R}$, regarded as a relational structure. More generally, an amorphous set Ω does not obviously imply that either $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ or $\mathrm{Age}(\mathcal{M})$ is amorphous; the set of 2-element subsets of Ω is definitely not amorphous, since we can take $\alpha \in \Omega$ and split the pairs into those containing α and the rest.

In the following appendix we give some results obtained by working in a set theory in which the axiom of choice is false.

6. Appendix: Bounded Amorphous Sets

6.1. The Theorem of Baer, Schreier and Ulam for Bounded Amorphous Sets. An infinite set U is amorphous if every subset of U is finite or cofinite; an amorphous set is *bounded* if there is a natural number n such that every non-trivial partition of U has all but finitely many parts of size m, for some $m \leq n$. In this appendix, as an exercise in working inside models of set theory in which the axiom of choice is false, we prove that within certain Fraenkel-Mostowski models of set theory, if U is bounded amorphous, then the symmetric group on U, $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$, modulo the group of finitary permutations, $\mathrm{FSym}(U)$, is isomorphic to a finite group, and that every finite group can occur, and as a corollary, a variation of the Baer–Schreier–Ulam theorem.

6.2. Permutations of a Bounded Amorphous Set. A set is said to be *amorphous* if it is infinite but is not the disjoint union of two infinite sets. Amorphous sets are *Dedekind finite*, that is have no countably infinite subset. The presence of Dedekind finite infinite cardinals means that the axiom of choice (AC) cannot hold.

Truss and co-workers [**162, 163, 532**] have carried out an extensive study aimed at classification of amorphous sets and their neighbours by examining the structure that an amorphous set can carry, using finite permutation groups as invariants. We will show that within certain Fraenkel-Mostowski models of set theory, that John Truss builds for

his classification of bounded amorphous sets [**532**], these groups have another role to play.

A permutation is *finitary* if it fixes all but finitely many points of U. The finitary permutations of U form a group $\mathrm{FSym}(U)$, the *finitary symmetric group* on U, which is a normal subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$. A finitary permutation has a *parity* (even or odd), just as for a permutation of a finite set; the even permutations form a subgroup of index 2 in $\mathrm{FSym}(U)$, the *alternating group* $\mathrm{Alt}(U)$. A *permutation group* [**107**] on U is a subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$. It is *transitive* if the only fixed subsets of U are $\varnothing$ and U, and *primitive* if in addition the only fixed partitions of U are $\{U\}$ and the partition into singletons.

In ZFC, the factor group $\mathrm{Sym}(U)/\mathrm{FSym}(U)$ has cardinality $2^{|U|}$, and its normal subgroups form a chain. Indeed by the Theorem of Baer, Schreier and Ulam [**19**] [**474**], the proper normal subgroups of $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$ are (i) the trivial group; (ii) $\mathrm{Alt}(U)$; (iii) the bounded symmetric group $\mathrm{BSym}_\alpha(U)$ consisting of all permutations moving fewer than α points, for each infinite cardinal $\alpha \le |U|$; (iv) $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$.

As we will see, the position is very different in the absence of the Axiom of Choice!

A set is *strictly amorphous* if in addition to being amorphous, it is also the case that in any partition of the set into infinitely many pieces, all except finitely many are singletons.

10.5. Theorem (Jordan–Wielandt Theorem). *Let U be an infinite set. Then a primitive permutation group on U containing a non-identity finitary permutation must contain the alternating group* $\mathrm{Alt}(U)$.

We remark that the proof of this theorem (see [**107**, p. 166]) makes no use of the axiom of choice, and is valid in ZF. With the help of this theorem, all transitive permutation groups on a strictly amorphous set can be described.

10.6. Theorem. *Let U be a strictly amorphous set. Then*

(1) $\mathrm{Sym}(U) = \mathrm{FSym}(U)$*;*
(2) *the only transitive subgroups of* $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$ *are* $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$ *&* $\mathrm{Alt}(U)$.

Proof. The proof of 1 is easy.

As for 2, if G is transitive, then any invariant partition has all its parts of the same size, and so (since U is strictly amorphous) must be trivial. The result now follows from the Jordan–Wielandt theorem. □

Let U be an amorphous set, that is it is infinite but is not the disjoint union of two infinite sets. We consider a partition of U to be *finitary* if all its parts are finite. If π is a finitary partition of U,

there is a unique integer $n(\pi)$ such that all but finitely many parts of π have size $n(\pi)$. The number $n(\pi)$ is the *gauge* of π. We say that U is *bounded* or *unbounded* according as the gauges of its finitary partitions are. If U is bounded, the *gauge* of U is the largest gauge of a non-trivial partition of U. If the gauge is 1 then the set is strictly amorphous.

An example will illustrate what can happen when we try to extend this last result to the permissible partitions of bounded sets. Suppose first that the gauge is 2, so that there is a partition of U with all but finitely many points lying in parts of size 2. Now there is a permutation of U which interchanges the points in each part of size 2 and fixes all other points. (No choice principle is required for this). This element lies in $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$ but not in $\mathrm{FSym}(U)$, so that the factor group has order at least 2 (and it is easy to see that equality holds).

Next suppose that the bound is 3. There are two possible cycles on a set of size 3, corresponding to its two cyclic orientations. If there is a choice function for the set of orientations, we can use it to construct a permutation in which all but finitely many points lie in 3-cycles, so that $|\mathrm{Sym}(U)/\mathrm{FSym}(U)| = 3$. But if no such choice function exists, then $\mathrm{Sym}(U) = \mathrm{FSym}(U)$.

The final theorem in this section does not rely on any particular FM model.

10.7. Theorem. *If a bounded amorphous set U has no partition into m-sets and finitely many other points, for $m > n$, then*

$$|\mathrm{Sym}(U) : \mathrm{FSym}(U)| \leq n.$$

Proof. Suppose all partitions of U have gauge $\leq n$, and suppose for a contradiction that $g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_{n+1} \in \mathrm{Sym}(U)$ lie in distinct right cosets of $\mathrm{FSym}(U)$. Let π_i be the partition consisting of the orbits of g_i. By Lemma 2.1 of [**532**] there is a finitary partition π such that each π_i refines π. By assumption, π has gauge $\leq n$. Now for $i \neq j$, $g_i g_j^{-1}$ is not finitary; denote its orbit partition by π_{ij}. The partition π can be chosen without loss of generality to dominate all others including π_{ij}. Hence $\exists X \in \pi$ of size $\leq n$ on which $g_i g_j^{-1}$ $(i \neq j)$ has no fixed points in X. Pick $x \in X$. Then xg_i for $1 \leq i \leq n+1$ are distinct members of X, contradiction. □

6.3. The Centralizer of the Gauge Group. In this section we assume that we are working in the particular models of FM mentioned in the Main Theorem (Theorem 10.8) below. Truss [**532**] showed that a bounded amorphous set of gauge n is determined, up to a notion of equivalence which is somewhat difficult to explain, by two parameters: the *gauge group* G_0 (a transitive subgroup of the symmetric group

$\mathrm{Sym}(n)$), and the *excess* (an integer from the set $\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$). In this section, by examining Truss's classification more closely, we will identify the finite group $\mathrm{Sym}(U)/\mathrm{FSym}(U)$ with the centralizer of the gauge group.

There are two aspects of Truss's work which we depend on. First, he shows how the gauge group and the excess are determined by the set U.

Second, he constructs a model of Fraenkel-Mostowski set theory in which the set of atoms is amorphous and has any prescribed gauge group and excess, and shows how a corresponding model of ZF can be obtained using the method of Jech and Sochor [**308**].

Note that, for any infinite set U, and any point $u \in U$, we have

$$\mathrm{Sym}(U)/\mathrm{FSym}(U) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(U \setminus \{u\})/\mathrm{FSym}(U \setminus \{u\}),$$

since $\mathrm{FSym}(U)$ is transitive and so meets every coset of $\mathrm{Sym}(U \setminus \{u\})$ in $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$. So it is enough to consider sets with excess equal to zero.

The gauge group is determined by U (up to conjugacy), so we can write it as $G(U)$. Its construction is given in [**532**, p. 199], where it is also shown that $G(U)$ acts transitively on $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$. Truss further shows [**532**, Corollary 5.11] that any bounded amorphous set takes the form of the above construction. In [**532**, Theorem 5.10] Truss shows the type of transitive model of FM in which the sets of the main theorem lie.

The permutation group acting finitarily on elements of U is $\mathcal{G} = (G \ Wr \, \mathrm{Sym}(\omega)) \cap \mathrm{FSym}(U) = G \ wr \, \mathrm{FSym}(\omega)$ where wr means the restricted wreath product.

10.8. Theorem (Main Theorem). *Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the transitive model of FM obtained using the Truss construction* [**532**] *and let U be a bounded amorphous set lying in $\mathcal{N}$ and having gauge $n = n(U)$ and gauge group $G(U)$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Sym}(U)/\mathrm{FSym}(U) \cong C_{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}(G(U)).$$

Proof. The proof of the theorem relies on the construction of bounded amorphous sets by Truss. In outline it begins with a model $\mathcal{M}$ of Fraenkel-Mostowski set theory with choice (FMC); a modification of ZFC allows a set U of atoms. A *permutation model* $\mathcal{N}$ is constructed using a permutation group G on U and a filter $\mathcal{F}$ of subgroups of G. The Fraenkel-Mostowski model $\mathcal{N}$ is defined recursively by the rule

$$\mathcal{N} = \{x \in \mathcal{M} : x \subseteq \mathcal{N} \text{ and } G_{\{x\}} \in \mathcal{F}\},$$

where $G_{\{x\}}$ denotes the setwise stabilizer of x in G. The bounded amorphous sets of the theorem lie in a specific model $\mathcal{N}$ of all 'hereditarily

symmetric' sets. The paper [**532**] can be referred to for a detailed exposition of the construction. We need the construction to show that every finite group can occur here. Usually it is assumed that the filter $\mathcal{F}$ contains the stabilizers of the elements of U. This guarantees that the elements of U (and hence U itself) all belong to the model $\mathcal{N}$.

It can also be shown that, under suitable hypotheses, most results obtained by FM methods, for example in $\mathcal{N}$, can be 'transferred' to a model of ZF with similar properties. The first general result that such a transfer was possible is the theorem of Jech and Sochor [**308**]. In all the cases that we need, the verification of the hypotheses has been done already (see Truss [**532**]), so we have nothing to do in this connection.

The proof of our main theorem uses the following three propositions. The proof of the first is in [**514**] and that of the second is in [**532**] and uses a restricted wreath product.

10.9. Proposition. *Suppose that a permutation model $\mathcal{N}$ is defined by a set U of atoms, a permutation group G on U, and a filter $\mathcal{F}$ of subgroups of G including the point stabilizers. Then $C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G) \in \mathcal{N}$.*

10.10. Proposition. *Let G_0 be a transitive subgroup of the symmetric group $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ in a model $\mathcal{M}$ of ZF, and let $G = G_0$ wr $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$, $U = n \times \omega$, and $\mathcal{F}$ the filter generated by the point stabilizers in G. Then in the corresponding permutation model $\mathcal{N}$, U is a bounded amorphous set with gauge n, gauge group G_0, and excess 0.*

10.11. Proposition. *With the notation of the preceding proposition,*

$$C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G) \cong C_{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}(G_0).$$

Proof. It is clear that, if $H_0 = C_{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}(G_0)$, and we extend the action of H_0 to $U = n \times \omega$ by letting it act on the first factor, then $H_0 \leq C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G)$.

Conversely, take any element h of $H = C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G)$. We claim first that h fixes every set $U_i = n \times \{i\}$ for $i \in \omega$. For there is a factor G_i of the base group of $G = G_0$ wr $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ which acts transitively on U_i and fixes all points of U_j for $j \neq i$; if h maps (x, i) to (y, j) for some $j \neq i$, then the condition $gh = hg$ for $g \in G_i$ would imply that every point of U_i would be mapped to (y, j), a contradiction.

Now, using the fact that h commutes with the top group $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$, we find that h acts in the same way on each set U_i; so $h \in H_0$, and the proof is complete. □

By Proposition 10.10, the bounded amorphous set can be realized as a countably infinite number of size n pieces in the model $\mathcal{M}$, and also G_0 is the gauge group $G(U)$.

The theory of Truss requires that the models in which we are working are transitive, that is that any member of a member of $\mathcal{N}$ is a member of $\mathcal{N}$. But this follows from the fact that $\mathcal{N}$ contains all hereditarily symmetric sets.

Let $g \in \mathrm{Sym}(U)$ in $\mathcal{M}$. Now by definition $g \in \mathcal{N}$ if and only if the stabilizer of g in $G = G_0 \; wr \, \mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ is in the filter $\mathcal{F}$. A permutation is a set of ordered pairs $g = \{(u, u^g) : u \in U\}$. The stabilizer of g is the set $\{h : (u, u^g)^h = (v, v^g)\}$ for some v in the operand. But then $(u^h, u^{gh}) = (v, v^g)$, and so $v = u^h$, $(u^h)^g = v^g = u^{gh}$, that is $h \in C_G(g)$. It follows that $g \in \mathcal{N}$ if and only if $C_G(g)$ contains $G_{(u_1,\ldots,u_n)}$ for some $u_1, \ldots, u_n \in U$.

Now $\mathrm{Sym}(U) = \{g : C_G(g) \geq G_{(u_1,\ldots,u_n)}$ for some $u_1, \ldots, u_n \in U\} = \{g : g \in C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G_{(u_1,\ldots,u_n)})$ for some $u_1, \ldots, u_n \in U\}$, where in the first set $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$ lies in $\mathcal{N}$ and in the second set $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$ lies in $\mathcal{M}$. Take $g \in \mathrm{Sym}(U)$ (in $\mathcal{N}$). Then g fixes the set $\{u_1, \ldots, u_n\}$ and fixes the set of fibres containing $u_1, \ldots, u_n$. On the remaining fibres, $g \in C_{\mathrm{Sym}(\tilde{U})}(\tilde{G})$, where $\tilde{G}$ is the group acting on the remaining fibres as $\tilde{G} \cong G$, $\tilde{U}$ is the set U minus the fibres containing $\{u_1, \ldots, u_n\}$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(\tilde{U}) \in \mathcal{M}$. By the proof of Proposition 10.11, g fixes all the fibres in $\tilde{U}$ and acts on each as an element $\overline{g} \in C_{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}(G_0)$. So we have a map (in $\mathcal{N}$) $\phi : \mathrm{Sym}(U) \to C_{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}(G_0) : g \mapsto \overline{g}$. Here $\ker(\phi)$ consists of permutations which, apart from finitely many fibres, are trivial, that is $\mathrm{FSym}(U)$. We know that $\mathrm{FSym}(U) \in \mathcal{N}$ because if $g' \in \mathrm{FSym}(U)$ then g' moves a finite set of points $\{u_1, \ldots, u_n\}$ and g' is centralized by $G_{(u_1,\ldots,u_n)} \in \mathcal{F}$. The homomorphism ϕ is onto because by Proposition 10.11, for every element of $C_{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}(G_0)$ there is an element of $C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G)$ ($\mathrm{Sym}(U) \in \mathcal{M}$), and each of these lies in $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$ ($\in \mathcal{N}$). So in $\mathcal{N}$, $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$ is an extension of $\mathrm{FSym}(U)$ by a group isomorphic to $C_{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}(G_0) \cong C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G)$, where $\mathrm{Sym}(U)$ in the latter group lies in $\mathcal{M}$. The product is semidirect because $\mathrm{FSym}(U) \lhd \mathrm{Sym}(U)$ while $C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G)$ is semiregular, so $\mathrm{FSym}(U) \cap C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G) = 1$. Note that taking $n = 0$ in $\mathrm{Sym}(U) = \{g : C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G_{(u_1,\ldots,u_n)})\}$ gives that $C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G) \in \mathcal{N}$; this is also proved in Proposition 10.9. Finally, both $C_{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}(G_0)$ and $C_{\mathrm{Sym}(U)}(G)$ are finite groups and so lie in $\mathcal{N}$ and the isomorphism between them also lies in the model because from the axioms of set theory, a bijection between finite sets lies in the model. Therefore $\mathrm{Sym}(U)/\mathrm{FSym}(U) \cong C_{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}(G_0)$ and so Theorem 10.8 is proved. □

10.12. Corollary (Baer–Schreier–Ulam Theorem for bounded amorphous sets). *Every finite group arises as the quotient* $\mathrm{Sym}(U)/\mathrm{FSym}(U)$ *for some bounded amorphous set* U.

PROOF. The main theorem immediately gives that the quotient $\mathrm{Sym}(U)/\mathrm{FSym}(U)$ is finite for the FM models of Theorem 10.8. Obviously, any finite group of order dividing n can be embedded as a semiregular subgroup in $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ in some transitive model of FM. □

Usually the non-AC equivalent of an AC theorem is a more restrictive result; there is a sense in which for this theorem the reverse is true.

More results can be found in [**514**], which contains a study of group actions on bounded and more general amorphous sets.

It is possible to build graphs from amorphous vertex sets, but they would have amorphous cardinality. Theorems such as that of Lachlan-Woodrow that classifies countable homogeneous graphs (see Chapter 11) fail, not only because the notion of countable no longer exists, but also because in the absence of the axiom of choice it is no longer certain that finite partial automorphisms will extend to total automorphisms, and so the notion of homogeneity is no longer appropriate. In fact it can be replace by "local homogeneity" [**532**].

The proof of [**285**, Theorem 2.1.2] demonstrates that, without the axiom of choice, there can be amorphous sets.

Finally, we mention one problem where the above result has had a bearing. The standard analysis showing that subgroups of bounded support are the only non-trivial normal subgroups of infinite symmetric groups, and that there are no nontrivial normal subgroups of small index, uses AC. Bowler and Forster proved [**71**] that if $|X| = \omega$ with $|X| = |X \times X|$ then $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$ has no nontrivial normal subgroups of small index. The corollary that proves the Baer–Schreier–Ulam Theorem for bounded amorphous sets indicates the necessity of some extra condition; in this case $|X| = |X \times X|$ was adopted. Their two-stage proof, first shows that every normal subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$ (of small index) must contain every *flexible* permutation, that is, one that fixes at least $|X|$-many points. Then they proved that the flexible permutations generate $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$. Their interest was in the universes of typed set theories and of Quine's New Foundations (NF) which satisfy the $|X| = |X \times X|$ condition, for if the symmetric group for such a universe has no nontrivial normal subgroups of small index then there is a simple theory of sets definable in such universes. Note that AC fails in NF, though New Foundations with urelements (NFU) is a consistent system, and is consistent with Choice. They applied their result to typed set theories, bounding the orbit sizes under the induced action of the symmetric group of the universe. They derived a wellfoundedness result for small

symmetric sets in these contexts, and a result limiting the sizes of well-founded sets in NF.

For more on NF set theory see the book [**218**] by Thomas Forster and the paper [**290**] by Randall Holmes.

CHAPTER 11

Further Directions

The will is infinite and the execution confined . . . the desire is boundless and the act a slave to limit.

William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida, Act 3 scene 2*

If the doors of perception were to be cleansed man would see everything as it truly is... Infinite.

William Blake, *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell, (1790-3) A Memorable Fancy, plate 14*

This chapter is an ensemble of notes together with suggested problems and speculations that are of varying degrees of difficulty and requiring differing levels of effort. They are intended to motivate interest in the subject and encourage further work whilst appealing to differing tastes. Some of the questions have a long introduction both for guidance and as an opportunity to introduce or remind the reader of certain theories. Not all will necessarily have positive solutions. Some arise directly from some of the work in the main text whilst others intersect with rather different parts of mathematics.

(1) *Classification of Countable Homogeneous Coloured Graphs.* The Lachlan-Woodrow Theorem for graphs [**346**] states that:

11.1. THEOREM. *A countable homogeneous graph is isomorphic to one of the following:*

(i) the disjoint union of p complete n-vertex graphs, where at least one of p and n is infinite, or its complement a p-partite graph; (ii) a Henson graph $\mathfrak{H}_k$ ($n \geq 3$), or the complement (see Chapter 2); (iii) the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$, (isomorphic to its complement).

A graph Γ is said to be *distance-transitive* if , given any vertices a, b, c, d such that $d(a, b) = d(c, d)$, there is an automorphism α of Γ such that $\alpha(a) = c$ and $\alpha(b) = d$. In terms of conditions, intermediate between the homogeneous and distance-transitive graphs are the *connected-homogeneous*

graphs, being those for which any isomorphism between *connected* finite induced subgraphs extends to a graph automorphism. The connected countably-homogeneous graphs were classified by Gray and Macpherson [**252**].

Related to these are the *distance-homogeneous graphs* [**403**] [**80**] which are countable and homogeneous in a language that uses binary relations to encode distance within the graph, that is there is a binary predicate P_k such that $P_k(v_1, v_2)$ holds if and only if $d(v_1, v_2) = k$. Note that if Γ is distance-homogeneous then $\Gamma(v)$ is homogeneous, since non-adjacent pairs in $\Gamma(v)$ are at distance 2. So the Lachlan-Woodrow Theorem classifies the countable distance-homogeneous diameter 2 graphs.

Find a multicoloured analogues to these notions and classify countable homogeneous m-coloured graphs.

(2) *Countable Homogeneous Metric Spaces.* A graph of diameter 2 is the same as a metric space in which the metric takes only the values 1 and 2. The graph $\mathfrak{R}$ is the unique countable homogeneous metric space with these properties. By the same methods we can construct countable universal homogeneous metric spaces with other sets of values of the metric:
- $\{1, 2, ..., d\}$ for any $d \geq 2$;
- the positive integers;
- the positive rationals.

In the first two cases we can modify the construction to produce the analogue of Henson's graph (that is, one that has no equilateral triangles with side 1), or a bipartite graph (that is, in which all triangles have even perimeter). Problem: classify the countable homogeneous metric spaces?

(3) *Hypermetric Space Theory.* M. Deza and co-workers have studied [**170**] hypermetric spaces, which can be represented uniquely up to a multiple by a distance $d_{G,t}$ for a graph G where $d_{G,t}(i, j) = 1$ or t respectively according to whether (i, j) is an edge or a non-edge in G. Is there a universal hypermetric space?

(4) *Some Transitivity Properties of Reducts of* $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$. H. Wielandt introduced variations of k-transitivity with high transitivity being the strongest condition; it is also stronger that oligomorphicity. In this item we outline two variations on the theme of multiple transitivity, one due to Π. M. Neumann and the other due to Neumann and C. Praeger, and ask which random

graph reducts admit either of them, or their relatives described below?

A permutation group G acting on a set X is *generously transitive* [**414**] if any two distinct points of X are interchanged by some element of G. More generally, a group G is generously k-transitive if for every $(k+1)$-element set X, $G^X_{\{X\}} = \mathrm{Sym}(k+1)$. Generous transitivity is a strengthening of multiple transitivity so that

11.2. Proposition. *If G is a generously k-transitive group on $|X| > k$ then it is k-transitive.*

Proof. Let G be a generously k-transitive group. Then

(a) G is generously $(k-1)$-transitive, so $G^X_{\{X\}} = \mathrm{Sym}(k)$ if $|X| = k$.

(b) If X, Y are k-sets with $|X \cap Y| = k-1$ then $|X \cup Y| = k+1$ so there is an element $g \in G_{X \cup Y}$ mapping X to Y.

(c) Then by induction on d where X, Y are k-sets with $|X \cap Y| = k - d$, there exists $g \in G$ mapping X to Y (via $d-1$ intermediate sets which sequentially pairwise intersect at all but one of their points).

So G is k-homogeneous (set-transitive). Finally (a) and (c) imply that G is k-transitive. □

An *orbital* of a permutation group G on Ω is an orbit of G on $\Omega \times \Omega$, and for a transitive group there is a bijection between its orbitals and the orbits of a point stabilizer; these latter are called *suborbits*. A G-orbit (subset of $\Omega \times \Omega$) is *self-paired* if and only if for any (or all) vertex pairs (v_1, v_2) there exists $g \in G$ such that $(v_1, v_2)g = (v_2, v_1)$. For an edge-coloured graph an orbital is equivalent to an edge-colour. A group G is generously transitive if and only if it is transitive and all its suborbits are self-paired. The automorphism groups of all homogeneous edge-coloured graphs, are generously transitive because the edges are undirected so an interchange of a vertex pair on an edge is an isomorphism that extends to an automorphism of the whole graph. So the groups $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ are all generously transitive for all m. This is not true for all homogeneous structures, and fails for example for $\mathbb{Q}$. In fact the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$ of all order preserving automorphisms of the rationals is highly set-transitive (and primitive and oligomorphic) but is not even 2-transitive.

A permutation group is a *three-star group* if it induces a non-trivial group on each 3-element subset of points [**416**]. In brief then, a group is generously transitive if every pair of points of the operand can be transposed whilst it is three-star if it effects some non-trivial permutation of any triangle. A primitive three-star group other than Alt(3) is generously transitive. Three-star transitivity and 2-transitivity are weakenings of generous 2-transitivity in different directions and there is not always an implication from one to the other. However generously transitive and 2-homogeneous implies 2-transitive. Three-star is upwards closed for homogeneous structures in general but three-star does not necessarily imply four-star which is similarly defined, as is exemplified by the following. Take a 4-ary relation R such that $R(a, b, c, d)$ holds if and only if a, b, c, d are distinct and $R(a, b, c, d) \Rightarrow \neg R(ga, gb, gc, gd)$ for any permutation g of a, b, c, d, and for any 4 points it holds in one possible order. If M is the corresponding Fraïssé structure and $G = \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ which is 3-transitive then $G^X_{\{X\}} = 1$ for $|X| = 4$. So we have constructed a 3-transitive group G such that the setwise stabilizer of any 4-set is trivial.

We begin applying this theory to random graph reducts. The group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is vertex transitive but not 2-transitive; that it is generously transitive follows because it is transitive and all its suborbits are self-paired by definition of automorphism group. The duality group $\mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ acts 2-transitively but not 3-transitively on $\mathfrak{R}$ because vertex triples containing 0 and 3 edges are not duality-equivalent to those containing 1 and 2 edges. The switching group $\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ acts 2-transitively but not 3-transitively on $\mathfrak{R}$ because vertex triples containing 0 and 2 edges lie in different switching classes to those containing 1 and 3 edges.

FIGURE 1. Failure of 4-transitivity of $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R})$

The biggest group $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R}) = \langle \mathrm{DAut}(\mathfrak{R}), \mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}) \rangle$ acts 3-transitively because the four possible configurations on 3 vertices, shown in Figure 2, are equivalent under $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R})$, but it does not act 4-transitively because for example the two 4-sets in Figure 1 are not $\mathrm{BAut}(\mathfrak{R})$-equivalent:



FIGURE 2. Three-star transitivity of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$

(5) *Pigeonhole Property.* The pigeonhole property (PP) is a very strong indivisibility property of a relational structure, and states that whenever X is the union of two disjoint induced substructures Y and Z, at least one of Y and Z is isomorphic to X. Induced means that the instances of relations in Y are all instances in X for which all the arguments lie in X. The empty and singleton sets have this property, but no larger finite structure does, since it can always be divided into two strictly smaller parts. Assuming the axiom of choice, any infinite structure has this property.

The PP is often useful in theorem-proving. For example in [**406**] it is reported how the gap that initially had arisen in the proof [**553**] [**517**] of Fermat's Last Theorem was closed by relating the infinite collection of Hecke rings by creating an infinite sequence of sets of pigeonholes and then showing that there must be objects arising in every set of pigeonholes.

To prove that $\mathfrak{R}$ has the PP using the $(*)$-condition, suppose that $\mathfrak{R}$ can be split into two pieces Y and Z, neither of which is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$. Since $Y \not\cong \mathfrak{R}$, there are finite sets U_1 and V_1 for which no "correctly joined" witness exists in Y. Similarly there are sets U_2 and V_2 with no witness in Z. Now put $U = U_1 \cup U_2$ and $V = V_1 \cup V_2$. Since the whole graph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$, there is a witness for U and V;

but, by assumption, this witness cannot lie in either Y or Z, a contradiction.

The PP for a non-trivial graph states that for every finite partition of its vertex set, the induced subgraph on at least one of the blocks is isomorphic to the graph. Up to isomorphism, the three simple countably infinite graphs having PP are the complete graph K_ω, its complement $\overline{K}_\omega$, and $\mathfrak{R}_{2,\omega}$. To prove this, let X be a countable graph with the PP. Partitioning X into the set of isolated vertices and the rest, we conclude that either X is null or it has no isolated vertices; we may assume the latter. Similarly we may assume that there is no vertex joined to all others. Suppose that $X \ncong \mathfrak{R}$; let U and V be finite sets having no correctly joined witness, and suppose that $|U \cup V|$ is minimal subject to this. We just concluded that this cardinality is at least 2. Assume that $U \neq \varnothing$ and choose $u \in U$. Then the set W of vertices joined to everything in U except u and to nothing in V is non-empty; let $Y = W \cup \{u\}$, and Z the remaining points. Then Y is not isomorphic to X; for the non-existence of a witness for U and V shows that u is joined to nothing in Z, so it is an isolated vertex in Y. Also, Z is not isomorphic to X, because the sets $U \setminus \{u\}$ and V have no witness in Z (all the witnesses lie in Y).

If we allow our language to have 3 binary relations we have seen that $\mathfrak{R}_{3,\omega} = \mathfrak{R}^{\mathrm{t}}$ has the PP.

If an *oriented graph*, that is a directed graph not containing two vertices joined in both directions by edges, were to have the PP, then the undirected underlying graph is one of the three listed above. So an oriented graph with the PP is null, a tournament, or an orientation of $\mathfrak{R}$.

The countable random tournament, arises with probability 1 if we choose the orientations independently at random. It shares many properties with the random graph, including a very similar number-theoretic construction: take the primes congruent to $-1 \pmod 4$, and put an arc from p to q if q is a quadratic residue mod p. A similar argument to the one with which we began shows that the random tournament has the PP.

Any countable totally ordered set whose order type is a limit ordinal (one with no greatest element) has the PP, for example, $\mathbb{N}$ with arcs directed from smaller to larger, or vice

versa. In [**60**] it was shown that these are the only possibilities for tournaments with the PP.

In [**59**] the countable tournaments and orders with PP were classified. It should be easy to show that $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ has the PP for all $m \geq 2$. Further, all binary relational structures with m different binary symmetric relations having PP have been classified and these correspond to multicoloured random graphs. We do not know if this has been done in the case of relations that are not symmetric. Not every homogeneous graph has PP, so settling this question would not suffice to give the classification of the previous question.

As for the orientations of $\mathfrak{R}$, there is a unique countable random oriented graph, which is an orientation of $\mathfrak{R}$, and which has the pigeonhole property. Diestel et al. [**172**] constructed and characterised an acyclic orientation of $\mathfrak{R}$ which has the pigeonhole property, and showed that this exhausts the possibilities. They classify the countably infinite oriented graphs which for every partition of their vertex sets into two parts, induce an isomorphic copy of themselves on at least one of the parts. These are the edgeless graph, the random tournament, the transitive tournaments of order type ω^α, and two orientations of $\mathfrak{R}$: the random oriented graph, and the newly-found random cyclic oriented graph.

A further generalization would ask for a structure with several (but only finitely many) binary relations. Adding new relations if necessary, we can assume that (i) all the relations are non-empty, that (ii) every ordered pair of distinct points satisfies exactly one of the relations, and that (iii) each relation is either symmetric (a graph) or skew-symmetric (an oriented graph), and in the latter case its converse is also a relation in our set. This accounts for the case of a general directed graph. There are two symmetric relations, "not joined" and "joined in both directions", and the remaining arcs and their reversals give a pair of skew-symmetric relations.

Suppose first that all the m relations are symmetric. Then, arguing as before, we can show that there is a unique structure, the random m-coloured complete graph. In this structure, each monochromatic subgraph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$.

Next, observe that in a set of relations as just defined, we can replace each converse pair of skew-symmetric relations by a symmetric relation without losing the PP. When this is done, we obtain the random m-coloured complete graph. Moreover,

the original skew-symmetric relation is then an orientation of $\mathfrak{R}$ with the PP, so we know the possibilities for its structure. One open question would be to put these pieces together.

Here are some variations on the same theme. Structures whose points are distributed among three pigeonholes, one of which contains a copy of the original have a form of the PP that is exactly equivalent to the original. That is, if X has the PP and is divided into three, then either the first pigeonhole has a copy of X, or the union of the other two does; in the latter case, one further application of the property gives the result. In the other direction, simply leave the third pigeonhole empty.

In [**60**] a variant was studied which turns out to be quite different. Suppose that, whenever the points are distributed among three pigeonholes, two of them together contain a copy of the original structure. Further questions can be investigated in order to uncover generalized pigeonhole properties along the lines of [**60**] where a relational structure A is said to satisfy the $P(n, k)$ property if whenever the vertex set of A is partitioned into n nonempty parts, the substructure induced by the union of some k of the parts is isomorphic to A.

Another open direction for further study would be to investigate the PP of ternary relations.

A weaker version of the pigeonhole property asks only that, if the points of X are distributed in two pigeonholes, then the structure in one of the pigeonholes contains a copy of X as an induced substructure. Such an X is called *indivisible*; this property has been studied by El-Zahar and Sauer [**195**], and others. There are too many of them for neat classifications.

Finally there may be another way of looking at the PP of random graphs worth studying, that is in terms of *self-similarity*. The countable complete, null and random graphs are the only simple graphs (up to isomorphism) with the property that if the graph vertex set is partitioned into two parts, then the induced subgraph on one of the parts is isomorphic to the graph [**103**]. Is there a nice connection between this property of (weak) self-similarity and the property of self-similarity that arises for linear fractals [**383**, Chapter 18], Cantor sets and related objects? Is there any random graph-like object whose evolution can be modeled as a self-similar stochastic process [**196**] that picks up this weak self-similarity?

(6) *Paris-Harrington construction of* $\mathfrak{R}$. The countable random graph is characterised by the property that, given any two finite sets U and V of vertices, there is a vertex z joined to everything in U and nothing in V.

Does there exist a construction of the random graph in which the witness z is not bounded by any provably computable function? Presumably this would be a graph whose isomorphism to R would be unprovable in Peano arithmetic. More specifically, is there a presentation of $\mathfrak{R}$ through which it can be constructed using a Paris-Harrington numbering [**427**] of vertices and edges, but that cannot be proved in Peano arithmetic to be $\mathfrak{R}$?

(7) *Universal Sequences.* Here is a construction of $\mathfrak{R}$: choose any universal set S of positive integers, and build the graph whose vertex set is the set of all integers, two vertices being joined if their difference belongs to S. We saw a construction of $\mathfrak{R}$ using prime numbers; here, perhaps, is another. Consider the zero-one sequence s whose nth term is 0 if the nth odd prime is congruent to 1 (mod 4), or 1 if the nth odd prime is congruent to 3 (mod 4). Is s universal?

(8) *Paradoxical Decompositions of* $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. There is an obvious decomposition of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ obtained by putting the vertices of the graph randomly into l classes, where with probability 1 each class contains a copy of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. This is easy because we do not require a group action. It is not paradoxical because we do not have a natural measure on $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$.

It has been said [**222**] that the key step in the proof of the Banach-Tarski Theorem is the Hausdorff paradox which generates three disjoint subsets I, J, K of the set of all transformations of the sphere using $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{Z}) = \langle \sigma, \rho : \sigma^2 = \rho^3 = 1 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_3$, such that $\rho(I) = J$, $\rho^2(I) = K$, $\sigma(I) = J \cup K$. This paradox states that the sphere (minus a countable set) can be divided into three disjoint subsets of points A, B, C such that A, B, C, and $B \cup C$ are pairwise congruent, mimicking the pairwise congruence of I, J, K and $J \cup K$ [**541**]. Lindenbaum [**361**] proved that no bounded set in the plane can have a paradoxical decomposition. As $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ is not a planar graph, this theorem does not apply. With Theorem 6.6 in mind, is there a paradoxical decomposition of this graph for the action of the modular group?

(9) *Amenability of* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$. There is a connection between Banach-Tarski paradoxes and the *nonamenability* of isometry

groups. A discrete group G is *amenable* if there is a left-invariant measure μ on G which is finitely additive and has total measure 1. That is if there is a function

$$\mu : \{\text{subsets of G}\} \to [0,1]$$

such that

(i) $\mu(gA) = \mu(A)$ for all $g \in G$ and all subsets $A \subseteq G$,

(ii) $\mu(G) = 1$, and

(iii) $\mu(A \cup B) = \mu(A) + \mu(B)$ if A and B are disjoint subsets of G.

Finite and abelian groups are amenable but the free group of rank two is not. Are any of the groups associated with the random graphs, in particular the automorphism groups, amenable?

(10) *A Conjugacy Class Representation of the Random Graph.* Does there exist a countable group G with the following properties:

(a) G has just two non-identity conjugacy classes, each inverse-closed,

(b) the Cayley graph $\mathrm{Cay}(G, C)$ is isomorphic to the countable random graph, where C is one of these classes.

We give one clue as to how one approach to this problem, using HNN-extensions (see Appendix 1), might proceed.

Recall from Appendix 14 that the loop multiplication group $\mathrm{Mlt}(L)$ of a loop L [**419**] is generated by the set of all left and right translations, that is the permutations defined by $L_a(x) = ax$ and $R_a(x) = xa$ for every $x \in L$, and the inner mapping group $I(L)$ of L is the stabilizer of the neutral element e

For a loop L, the transversals $A = \{L_a : a \in L\}$ and $B = \{R_a : a \in L\}$ are said to be $I(L)$-*connected* to $I(L)$ in $\mathrm{Mlt}(L) = \langle A, B\rangle$ if $[A, B] \leq I(L)$.

Suppose we have a loop multiplication group $\mathrm{Mlt}(L)$ whose pointwise stabilizer satisfies

$$\mathrm{Mlt}(L)_\alpha \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})_\alpha$$

and has m orbits on points $\beta \neq \alpha$ that is points joined to α by edges on m colours. If L were a group and $\alpha = 1$, then $\mathrm{Mlt}(L)_\alpha = L$ acting by conjugation $l \mapsto alb$ stabilizes 1 if and only if $ab = 1$ or $a = b^{-1}$. So we require that L has at least m non-identity conjugacy classes, that is $\mathrm{Mlt}(L)_\alpha$ has at least m

orbits. So is there a group L which has m non-identity conjugacy classes such that $\mathrm{Mlt}(L) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$? Does the infinite Moufang Loop of Theorem 6.27 satisfy analogous conditions?

Right loops can arise as algebraic structures on transversals, and this impacts on the question of multiplication group action of a quasigroup or loop. To within right loop isomorphism, every right loop can be obtained from the transversal to the stabilizer of the identity in the right multiplication group of the loop.

Let T be a *right transversal* to a subgroup H of loop multiplication group $G = \langle g \rangle$. The natural G action on T, denoted by $\star$ is given by:

$t \star g := u$ where u is the representative in T of the coset Htg.

Restricted to T itself it endows T with a binary operation, so that T is a *magma*, denoted $\underline{T}$ which can be thought of as the *right quotient* of G by H.

The following Lemma [**419**] [**432**] characterizes loop multiplication groups:

11.3. Lemma. *A group G is the multiplication group of some loop L if and only if it has a subgroup H and two right transversals A and B to H in G, such that $[A, B] \leq H$, $\underline{A}$ coincides with L, the core of H in G is trivial, and $\langle A, B \rangle = G$, where $\langle A, B \rangle$ is the subgroup generated by A and B.*

We apply this lemma to a loop which we take to be a group. Let $G_1 = \langle g \rangle$ be the multiplication group of a loop that is a group, and let $G_2 = \langle G_1, t : t^{-1}gt = g' \rangle$ be an HNN-extension (see Appendix 1), where $g, g' \in G_1$ have the same order. Keep $H = G_1$ constant in Lemma 11.3. Then $\mathrm{Core}_{G_2}(G_1) = 1$.

Elements in G_2 are words in $t, g \in G_2 \backslash H, H$. Note that tH is a left coset of G_2 relative to H (or a left coset containing t, or a left coset generated by t); so words of type $tgh = g'th$ are left cosets of G_2.

Furthermore if A is a transversal for H in G_1 and U is a transversal for G_1 in G_2 then AU is a transversal for H in G_2. To see this, first note that $Gu \subseteq (Ha)u$ because every $g \in G$ must lie in a coset of H, so $gu = hau$ for some $a \in A$. The opposite inclusion follows because $G = \bigcup Ha$. Firstly we must check that the HNN-extended $A^* = AU$ and $B^* = A_1U_1$ are still transversals. Secondly we must check that conjugacy classes remain at every HNN extension and that they

are *not* conjugated to each other. Then, iterating the HNN-extension a countable infinity of times and taking the union of the groups gives G_∞. Outer automorphisms permute the conjugacy classes within the Cayley graph of G_∞.

Another approach is to ask whether or not there is a 3-colouring of the projective line over a field $\mathbb{Q}$, $\mathbf{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$, with all colour classes dense and such that the induced colouring of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ gives the triality graph? (We already know that $\mathfrak{R}$ can be derived from $\mathbb{Z}^2$ [**108**]).

Note that if we are choosing our field to be $\mathbb{Q}$ then we do not need a density argument; density is a residual property, so is automatically present, and indeed any countable collection of residual properties can be attached.

More generally, assume that there is a group G for which $G\backslash\{1\} = A_1 \sqcup \ldots \sqcup A_m$, $A_i^{-1} = A_i$, $\mathrm{Cay}(G, A_1, \ldots, A_m) \cong \mathfrak{R}_{m,n}$. Then proceed with either the further assumption that

(C) If $a, b \in A_i$ then $a^n, b^n \in A_{i(n)}$ for some $i(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, or the stronger assumption

(C') For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a, a^n have the same colour.

(11) *Henson Graphs.* Henson's graph $\mathfrak{H}_k$, for $k > 2$, is the unique countable homogeneous graph whose finite subgraphs are the finite graphs containing no complete graph of size k. The groups $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{H}_k)$ have been shown to be simple by Macpherson and Tent. (i) Does $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{H}_k)$ have the small index property, that is, is it the case that a subgroup of countable index contains the pointwise stabilizer of a finite set?

(ii) Are the groups $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{H}_k)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{H}_l)$ non-isomorphic for distinct k and l?

(iii) Is $\mathfrak{H}_k$ a Cayley graph for $k > 3$.

(12) *Graph Limits and Random Graphs.* In Appendix 9 we mention the relatively recent work on graph limits and the theory of exchangeable measures which was begun by Bruno de Finetti in the 1930s. Here we ask for links between this theory and the older theory of random graphs with forbidden subgraphs. We motivate the question.

There are many models for such a graph. For example, we could add vertices one at a time, and for each new vertex, choose its neighbour set randomly among all the possibilities which don't violate the restriction; in particular we could pick a random independent set in the existing graph to be the neighbour set of the new vertex.

Provided the restriction is such that this can always be done, then we have a probability measure on the set of all graphs on a given countable vertex set, with the property that the restriction holds with probability 1.

Alternatively, list the vertex pairs and consider one pair at a time. If the restriction does not force the pair considered to be a non-edge or an edge then decide at random. Again, provided we can continue indefinitely, this defines a probability measure as required. Unfortunately, it may define many different measures; there is no obvious reason why different orderings of the pairs should give the same measure. Two obvious test cases are lexicographic and reverse lexicographic ordering of the pairs.

The many variants all have the disadvantage that they depend on some ordering of the vertex set (or the set of pairs of vertices, or something). To motivate finding a measure which did not require a choice of an ordering we ask: what is the probability that two vertices are joined by an edge in a random triangle-free graph? In the ordering models, this depends on the choice of ordering. In the model where the ordering of pairs begins $\{1,2\},\{1,3\},\{2,3\},\dots$, the probability that $\{1,2\}$ is an edge is clearly $\frac{1}{2}$, and the same for $\{1,3\}$; but the probability that $\{2,3\}$ is an edge is only $\frac{3}{8}$ (since if we chose both $\{1,2\}$ and $\{1,3\}$, then $\{2,3\}$ would be forbidden).

Taking "probability" to mean "limiting frequency" suggests that the probability that any pair, say $\{1,2\}$, is an edge should be the limiting edge-density in large triangle-free graphs. Here it is convenient for the "large triangle-free graphs" to be labelled, that is, to have vertex set $\{1,\dots,N\}$; then the required edge-density is equal to the proportion of these graphs in which $\{1,2\}$ is an edge. More generally, we define a measure by saying that, if Γ_H is a triangle-free graph (with vertex set $\{1,2,\dots,n\}$), then the "frequency of Γ_H in N-vertex graphs" should be the proportion of triangle-free graphs on the vertex set $\{1,2,\dots,N\}$ which induce Γ_H on $\{1,2,\dots,n\}$. Now suppose that this frequency tends to a limit as $N\to\infty$. Then, for any vertices $v_1,\dots,v_n$ in the infinite set, we let the event that these vertices induce Γ_H be this limiting frequency; this defines the required measure.

In this case, a theorem of Erdős, Kleitman and Rothschild which says [**203**] that 'almost all finite triangle-free graphs

are bipartite', in the sense that the proportion of triangle-free graphs which are bipartite tends to 1 as the number of vertices tends to ∞; see §6 of Chapter 2. This implies that the probability that any odd number n of vertices in the random graph induce a cycle is zero; so the random infinite triangle-free graph is almost surely (that is, with probability 1) bipartite.

Consider next the age of a graph Γ, that is the class of finite graphs embeddable in Γ as induced subgraphs. Whilst different infinite graphs may have the same age, there may be one of specific interest. So for example, the class of all finite graphs is an age, and the most interesting infinite graph of which it is the age is the random graph. For the finite triangle-free graphs, Henson's infinite graph has this age. So our earlier remarks show that Henson's graph is not "the random triangle-free graph". (However, it is the typical triangle-free graph in the sense of Baire category.)

Open Question Let $\mathcal{A}(\Gamma)$ be a fixed age of finite graphs, and let Γ_H be a fixed graph on the vertex set $\{1,\ldots,n\}$. For $N \geq n$, let $p_N(\Gamma_H)$ be the proportion of graphs in $\mathcal{A}(\Gamma)$ (on the vertex set $\{1,\ldots,N\}$) which induce Γ_H on the first n vertices. Is it true that $p_N(\Gamma_H)$ tends to a limit $p(\Gamma_H)$ as $N \to \infty$?

If this is true, then we define a probability measure on graphs on a given countable vertex set by the rule that the event that a given n-tuple of vertices induces Γ_H should be $p(\Gamma_H)$. We can then ask a second question:

Open Question What does the random graph in this model look like?

(Clearly, with probability 1, its age is contained in $\mathcal{A}(\Gamma)$; the containment may be proper, as in the case of the random triangle-free graph.)

As we mentioned the recent developments in infinitary limit objects for sequences of combinatorial objects are related to probabilistic results about exchangeable measures. The simplest case is that of measures on 0–1 sequences, which we can regard as functions from the natural numbers to $\{0,1\}$. Such a measure is called "exchangeable" if it is unaffected by arbitrary permutations of the natural numbers.

Exchangeability means that the probability measure is invariant under permutations, not any particular random object. The simplest example of an exchangeable probability measure is given by tossing a biased coin countably often. A slightly

more complicated measure is defined as follows: take two biased coins with different probabilities of heads; choose one of the two according to some probability measure; then generate the random sequence using this coin.

This concept was introduced by de Finetti who worked on the foundations of probability in the 1930s. He proved a representation theorem for exchangeable measures. Any such measure is defined by a function f from $[0,1] \times [0,1] \to [0,1]$ by the following rule. Choose u uniformly from $[0,1]$; for each natural number n, choose u_n uniformly from $[0,1]$, with all choices independently; then let the nth term of the random binary sequence be chosen to be 1 with probability $f(u,u_n)$, independently for all n. It is an exercise for the reader to find the function f representing each of the two examples above.

In the 1980s, this result was extended by Hoover and further by Aldous. We now define a probability measure on graphs on the vertex set $\mathbb{N}$ to be exchangeable if it is invariant under permutations of the natural numbers. The measure giving the "random graph with age contained in $\mathcal{A}(\Gamma)$" described earlier is clearly exchangeable.

Aldous and Hoover gave a representation theorem for exchangeable random graph measures similar to de Finetti's except that the function replacing f has three variables rather than two.

In an important special case, ergodicity can be used to show that the function is independent of the first parameter, so is really a symmetric function from $[0,1]^2$ to $[0,1]$. As in de Finetti's case, the values of the function give the probabilities of seeing a given induced subgraph on a given set of vertices.

In fact, what we have here is precisely a a limit of a sequence of finite graphs called a *graphon*. In brief, from the graph Γ_n in a sequence (Γ_n) of finite graphs, define a probability distribution μ_n on graphs with at most k vertices, for any given k, by choosing k random vertices of Γ_n and taking the induced subgraph. (The words "at most" allow for the event that the same vertex is picked more than once.) The sequence (Γ_n) converges if, for every fixed k, the probability measures μ_n converge to a limit μ. (This can also be expressed, using inclusion-exclusion, in terms of graph homomorphisms; the condition for convergence is that, for any fixed finite graph Γ_H, the probability $t(\Gamma_H,\Gamma_n)$ that a random map from Γ_H to Γ_n converges to a limit $t(\Gamma_H,\Gamma)$.)

A graphon is the "limit" of a convergent sequence of finite graphs. But what is one? It can be described by a function W from $[0,1]^2$ to $[0,1]$, which is symmetric and measureable. The measure μ is defined from the graphon as follows: pick any real numbers $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ in the unit interval; restricted to these, W defines a symmetric matrix of order k. Now join i to j with probability $W(x_i, x_j)$.

Open Question What is the connection with the above question about random graphs with given age.

However, something is still missing. The graphon corresponding to the random graph is the function W which takes the constant value $\frac{1}{2}$.

Open Question Can the remarkable properties of the random graph be extracted from the constant function $\frac{1}{2}$? If so, how?

Also, changing $\frac{1}{2}$ to any other number between zero and one presumably gives a different graphon, but gives the same countable random graph!

An automorphism of a graphon is a measure-preserving permutation of $[0,1]$ that preserves the value of the function almost everywhere. After some standardization the automorphism group of any graphon is compact. The orbits of the automorphism group can be characterized by certain generalized degrees. The tools required to prove these results include topologies on the set of points of a graphon. Some properties of the graphon automorphism groups carry over to the limit objects of graph sequences; for example, the limit of graphs with vertex-transitive automorphism groups is a graphon with a point-transitive automorphism group. In this joint work of Lovász and Szegedy, the transition to the limit is not completely understood.

We end by noting an application of Petrov and Vershik's construction [**429**] of probability measures on the set of graphs on a countable vertex set which is *exchangable*, that is, invariant under all permutations in the symmetric group, (see below) and concentrated on Henson's universal triangle-free graph. Their approach of building topological or measure-theoretic triangle-free graphs on the real numbers means that triangles are not totally excluded, as long as the chance of getting one is zero; similarly, the universality axioms are not reqired to hold universally, only with high probability.) Then they obtain a

countable graph by taking countably many independent samples from a probability distribution on the real numbers. The actual distribution used is not crucial; a Gaussian distribution suffices. The resulting graph is isomorphic to Henson's graph with probability 1.

Using Aldous' Theorem on exchangeable measures Petrov and Vershik completely characterize all measures with the required property. This probably discounts a finitary approach building a graph one vertex at a time.

Nate Ackerman, Cameron Freer and Rehana Patel proved that there is an exchangeable measure concentrated on the structures isomorphic to a countably infinite structure $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if the stabiliser of a finite number of points in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ fixes no additional points, or more precisely,

11.4. Theorem (N. Ackerman, C. Freer, and R. Patel). *Let L be a countable relational language, $\mathcal{M}$ a countable L-structure with underlying set $\mathbb{N}$, and S_L the measurable space of all L-structures with underlying set $\mathbb{N}$, equipped with the natural Borel σ-algebra (generated by sets of the form $\{\mathcal{M} \in S_L : \mathcal{M} \vDash R(n_1, \ldots, n_i)\}$, where $n_1, \ldots, n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in L$. The following are equivalent:*

(1) There is a probability measure on S_L, invariant under the action of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{N})$*, that is concentrated on (the isomorphism class of) $\mathcal{M}$.*

(2) "Group-theoretic" definable closure in $\mathcal{M}$ is trivial, that is for every finite tuple $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $dcl_{\mathcal{M}}(\boldsymbol{a}) = \boldsymbol{a}$, where the definable closure *$dcl_{\mathcal{M}}(\boldsymbol{a})$ is the collection of $b \in \mathcal{M}$ that are fixed by all automorphisms of $\mathcal{M}$ fixing $\boldsymbol{a}$ pointwise.*

Part of the proof follows Petrov and Vershik in constructing a topological version of the structure in the real numbers, and then sampling countably many independent reals from a fixed distribution and taking the induced substructure.

For example, it holds for the random graph, or for the rational numbers as ordered set, but not for an infinite path or tree (where the stabiliser of two points fixes every point in the interval joining them). For homogeneous structures in a finite relational language, having trivial *dcl* is equivalent to having strong amalgamation.

11.5. Corollary. *Suppose further that L is finite and $\mathcal{M}$ is homogeneous with age $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) There is an invariant measure on S_L that is concentrated on $\mathcal{M}$.
(2) $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ has the strong amalgamation property.

(13) *B-groups.* A group G is a B-group if every primitive permutation group containing the regular representation of G is doubly transitive. There are many finite B-groups (including cyclic groups of composite order), but no countably infinite B-groups are known.

Does there exist a countably infinite B-group?

Let G be the infinite dicyclic group, generated by two elements a and b, where b has order 4 and inverts a. Is G a B-group? (Note that the countable random graph is not a Cayley graph for G; so the standard method for showing a group is not a B-group fails).

(14) *Group Actions on Random Hypergraphs.* A *tournament* is a binary relation b with trichotomy, that is exactly one of $b(x,y)$, $x = y$, $b(y,x)$ holds for each pair x, y of points. There is no obvious way of defining a countable homogeneous random triality tournament, the tournament equivalent to $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, because tournaments forbid symmetric joining relations. However one way of defining a *hypergraph* equivalent to $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ is to consider the m-coloured k-complete k-uniform hypergraph, where each hyperedge comprises a k-subset of the vertex set in which every vertex is joined to every other vertex. Investigate the properties of this object. The I-property for the countable universal homogeneous k-uniform hypergraph asserts that, given a finite set A of vertices, and a set B of $(k-1)$-subsets of A, there is a vertex z such that, for a $(k-1)$-subset $K \subset A$, $K \cup \{z\}$ is a hyperedge if and only if $K \in B$.

Produce a classification theorem that is the m-coloured equivalent of that of S. Thomas [**519**], which classifies the reducts of the countable universal homogeneous random k-hypergraphs for all $k \geq 1$, which apart from the relevant automorphism and symmetric groups all turn out to be suitably-defined generalizations of switching groups. Furthermore, the unique countable universal homogeneous k-hypergraph $\mathfrak{Hyp}$ has an infinite automorphism group $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{Hyp})$ that is not k-transitive because it preserves k-hyperedges of $\mathfrak{Hyp}$ [**54**]. However any two k-hypergraphs of size $k-1$ are isomorphic because they have no hyperedges, so G is $k-1$-transitive by the

homogeneity of $\mathfrak{Hyp}$. Find all homogeneous k-uniform hypergraphs for fixed k and develop some theory of multicoloured complete k-uniform hypergraphs.

(15) *Switchings & Reducts of Random Homogeneous Tournaments.* Classify the reducts of random homogeneous tournaments. We give an introduction to this topic.

Two tournaments T_1 and T_2 on the same vertex set X are said to be *switching equivalent* if X has a subset Y such that T_2 arises from T_1 by switching all arcs between Y and its complement $X\backslash Y$. The abstract finite groups which are full automorphism groups of switching classes of tournaments were characterized in [**18**]. In doing so, they describe two objects "equivalent" to switching classes of tournaments, one of which is the following. A tournament can be regarded as an antisymmetric function f from ordered pairs of distinct vertices to $\{\pm 1\}$ (with $f(x,y) = +1$ if and only if there is an arc from x to y). Switching with respect to $\{x\}$ corresponds to changing the sign of f whenever x is one of the arguments; and switching with respect to an arbitrary subset is performed by switching arcs between vertices in the subset and those in the complement. Given a tournament f, define an *oriented two-graph* to be a function g on ordered triples of distinct elements satisfying

$$g(x,y,z) = f(x,y)f(y,z)f(z,x).$$

Then g is alternating (for interchanging two arguments changes the sign) and satisfies the "cocycle" condition

$$g(x,y,z)g(y,x,w)g(z,y,w)g(x,z,w) = +1.$$

Conversely, any oriented two-graph arises from a tournament in this way, and two tournaments yield the same oriented two-graph if and only if they are equivalent under switching. Thus there is a natural bijection between switching classes of tournaments and oriented two-graphs; corresponding objects have the same automorphism group. It transpires from Fraïssé's Theorem that both the class of switching classes of finite tournaments, and the class of "local orders" (that is, tournaments switching-equivalent to linear orders), give rise to countably infinite structures with interesting automorphism groups.

Lachlan determined [**345**] that there are three countable homogeneous tournaments, (see also Cherlin [**138**]): the transitive tournament $\mathbb{Q}$, the homogeneous local order, and the

homogeneous tournament T containing all finite tournaments. The homogeneous oriented two-graph corresponds to the switching class of T.

Let us recall some homological algebraic theory [**132**] applied to graph theory [**103**] [**106**]. Let Γ be a graph and Λ be an abelian group. The 0-*cochain* on Γ (with coefficients in Λ) is a function from vertices of Γ to Λ. A 1-*cochain* is a Λ-function from ordered edges, where the sign depends on edge-direction. The 1-*coboundary* ∂e of a 0-chain e is given by $\partial e(x,y) = e(y) - e(x)$, and the 2-*coboundary* of a 1-chain f is the function on oriented induced cycles whose value on a cycle C is the sum of the values of f on the ordered edges of C. Two 1-cochains have the same 2-coboundary if and only if they differ by the 1-coboundary of a 0-chain.

In the case that Γ is complete and $\Lambda = C_2 = \{0,1\}$, a 0-cochain (respectively a 1-cochain) is the characteristic function of a vertex (respectively edge) set of a graph. If e is a 1-cochain, then ∂e is a complete bipartite graph, and adding it to f corresponds to switching the graph represented by f with respect to the subset represented by e. The 2-coboundary of f is the two-graph, the set of triples containing an odd number of graph edges.

Given a 1-chain f on Γ with vertex set V, the graph Γ_f has vertex set $V \times \Lambda$, where vertices (x,α) and (y,β) are adjacent if $f(x,y) = \beta - \alpha$. The graph Γ_f is a cover of Γ, with covering projection p given by $p(x,\alpha) = x$. If $f' = f + \partial e$ for some 0-cochain e, then the map $(x,\alpha) \mapsto (x, \alpha + e(x))$ is an isomorphism from Γ_f to $\Gamma_{f'}$. So the covering graph depends only on the coboundary of f. The following result is from [**103**] [**106**].

11.6. Theorem (P. J. Cameron). *If Γ is a countable graph whose age has the strong amalgamation property, and Λ a finite or countable abelian group, then there exists a universal homogeneous 2-coboundary on Γ (with coefficients in Λ).*

It follows that the universal homogeneous two-graph has an incarnation as the universal homogeneous 2-coboundary over $\mathbb{Z}/2$ on the complete graph, meaning that it can be constructed as the coboundary of $\mathfrak{R}$, where a graph is regarded as the 1-cochain on the complete graph, edges and non-edges corresponding to values 1 and 0, respectively [**103**] [**106**]. Is it true that the universal co-chain on the complete graph over $\mathbb{Z}/3$, which includes valuations over ordered triples, that is

two edges joined at a vertex corresponding to the value 2, is a reduct of the random oriented graph or the universal $\mathbb{Z}/3$ cochain on a complete graph?

Assigning the graph edges as follows leads to the have the



possibilities in Figure 4.

There will be three different types of switching, between pairs of $0, +1$ and -1 configurations; for example,

FIGURE 3. Example of a 0 - +1 Switching

is a switch with respect x.

Is the automorphism group of this structure strictly larger than that of the random oriented graph? This is the same as the universal homogeneous coboundary, so by definition it is a reduct, but is it the trivial reduct or are there non-trivial automorphisms?

(16) *Infinite Association Schemes.* An *association scheme* [**21**] with m classes on a finite set Ω is a partition of $\Omega \times \Omega$ into sets $\mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_m$ of binary relations (called *associate classes*) such that

(i) $\mathcal{C}_0$ is the diagonal $\{(x,x) : x \in \Omega\}$ of Ω^2

(ii) $\mathcal{C}_i$ is symmetric for $i = 1, \ldots, m$;

(iii) for all $i, j, k \in \{0, \ldots, m\}$ there is an integer p_{ij}^k such that for all $(x,y) \in \mathcal{C}_k$, $p_{ij}^k = |\{z \in \Omega : (x,z) \in \mathcal{C}_i \text{ and } (z,y) \in \mathcal{C}_j\}|$. The number p_{ij}^k is independent of x and y.

If $(x,y) \in \mathcal{C}_i$ then x and y are called i-th associates. If G is transitive then the partition of $\Omega \times \Omega$ into G-orbits satisfies (i) and (iii); condition (ii) is satisfied if G is generously transitive.

There is a second definition of association scheme, given in terms of edge-coloured graphs. An association scheme with m associate classes on a finite set Ω is an edge-colouring of



FIGURE 4. $\mathbb{Z}/3$ Switching Configurations

the complete undirected graph with vertex-set Ω by m colours such that

$(iii)'$ for all $i, j, k \in \{0, \ldots, m\}$ there is an integer p_{ij}^k such that whenever $\{x, y\}$ is an edge of colour k then $p_{ij}^k = |\{z \in \Omega : \{x, z\} \text{ has colour } i \text{ and } \{z, y\} \text{ has colour } j\}|$.

$(iv)'$ every colour is used at least once;

$(v)'$ there are integers a_i for $i \in \{0, \ldots, m\}$ such that each vertex is contained in exactly a_i edges of colour i.

The analogue of (i) above is not required because every edge has two distinct vertices and the analogue of (ii) is not required because we have specified an undirected graph.

Generously transitive groups are characterised by the property that the partition of the edge set of the complete graph on X into G-orbits is an association scheme whose *Bose-Mesner algebra* is the centralizer algebra of G, the algebra of all matrices commuting with permutation matrices corresponding to

elements of G. If $rank(G) = m+1$ then the association scheme has m classes and $m+1$ symmetric binary relations on X, the first of which is the relation of equality.

The matrix representation of a binary representation $\mathcal{C}$ on Ω has rows and columns indexed by Ω and entries $(x,y) = 1$ if $(x,y) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $(x,y) = 0$ otherwise. The representation of the association scheme in terms of matrices $A_0, \ldots, A_m$ then translates to

(BM1) $A_0 + \ldots + A_m = J$, where J is the all-1 matrix,
(BM2) $A_0 = I$, where I is the identity matrix,
(BM3) $A_i^T = A_i$, for all i,
(BM4) $\exists$ 'intersection numbers' p_{ij}^k such that

$$A_i A_j = \sum_{k=0}^{m} p_{ij}^k A_k.$$

Axiom (BM2) and (BM4) imply that $\{A_i\}$ spans an algebra (over $\mathbb{C}$). This is the Bose-Mesner algebra. Axiom (BM3) implies that the algebra is semisimple. The matrices are symmetric and commuting so the vector space $\mathbb{R}^\Omega$ has an orthogonal decomposition into common eigenspaces of the matrices. The identity $p_{ij}^k = p_{ji}^k$ implies that the $\{A_i\}$ commute pairwise. That the m-dimensional span (over $\mathbb{R}$) of the matrices is closed under multiplication means that the algebra is commutative.

The theory of *coherent configurations* (c.c.) was develped by Higman as operands of non-2-transitive finite permutation groups. Boris Weisfeiler introduced the equivalent notion of cellular algebras in the USSR [**546**], where they arise in the "partition refinement" approach to the graph isomorphism problem. An association scheme is a symmetric coherent configuration. For any permutation group G acting on Ω, the partition $\mathcal{K}(G)$ of Ω^2 into orbits of G is a c.c. Note that G is transitive if and only if $\mathcal{K}(G)$ is homogeneous (so that $A_0 = I$); also G is 2-transitive if and only if $\mathcal{K}(G)$ attains its smallest dimension of 2 if and only if the c.c. is trivial. A 2-transitive G has two orbits on Ω^2 with characteristc functions I and $J - I$, so is *AS-free*, that is the transitive group G preserves no non-trivial association scheme on operand Ω.

The set of partitions of Ω^2 forms a lattice (with "smaller" = finer), called the *partition lattice*. The set of coherent configurations is a meet-semilattice of the partition lattice. Hence, given any family F of subsets of Ω^2, there is a unique finest

coherent configuration containing them, which we call the coherent configuration generated by F. The partition into singletons forms the "trivial" coherent configuration.

More on links between association schemes and permutation groups can be found in [**10**] and [**251**].

The first open question that we pose is find a definition of *infinite* association schemes and develop a theory. Clearly none of the p_{ij}^k can be infinite otherwise the theory falls down. This may well require a "local-finiteness" condition, such as requiring that only a finite number of the p_{ij}^k are non-zero. If G has only finitely many orbits on Ω^2 then certainly only finitely many p_{ij}^k are nonzero; this may be the only tractable case. But there is thus far no theory for this situation.

The condition that all p_{ij}^k are finite is equivalent to requiring that the point stabilizer G_x of the group G acting on the underlying set Ω has all only finite orbits, which is the condition for the group to be locally compact. This equivalence should yield an interesting theory on further study. There should also be a measure-theoretic version of this question for which the measure satisfies $\mu\{z \in \Omega : (x,z) \in \mathcal{C}_i \text{ and } (z,y) \in \mathcal{C}_j\} < \infty \ \forall i,j,k$. It may be possible to tie this up with the work of Möller and co-workers on totally disconnected locally compact groups via graphs and permutations; see [**382**] and [**341**] and references therein for details.

A comprehensive reference for the theory of association schemes is the book by R. A. Bailey [**21**], the notes by Chris Godsil or the paper [**110**].

(17) *Association Schemes and Galois Theory.* Building on earlier work, Chris Godsil used Galois theory to establish a correspondence between certain subfields of a splitting field and subschemes of association schemes, where the splitting field of the scheme is the extension of the rationals generated by the eigenvalues of the scheme. Is there a further connection with switching groups regarded as Galois groups? In particular, concretely realize the following correspondences:



(18) *Invariant Relations of Permutation Groups.* Investigate possible links between random graph automorphism groups, finitary switching groups or other reducts and the work of Liebeck and Praeger [**358**] [**446**] on *relation algebras* of binary relations. They study the Galois connection between the subalgebra lattice of the relation algebra of all binary relations on a finite set Ω and the subgroup lattice of subgroups of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$. The Galois closed subgroups are the permutation groups that are *2-closed* in the sense of Wielandt [**552**], that is the largest subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ which preserves the orbits of G in its coordinate-wise action on the set $\Omega \times \Omega$. An example of a 2-closed permutation group is the full automorphism group of a graph, because any vertex permutation which preserves the orbits on ordered pairs will preserve adjacency. (Groups of switching permutations on more than two colours are highly transitive have no group-invariant relational structure).

Alternatively investigate the reducts from the viewpoint of *Krasner algebras* [**210**], these being the set of invariant relations on a set Ω which is a union of k-closed relation algebras defined on Ω^k, $\forall k \geq 2$. These can also be put in Galois correspondence with the set of permutations on Ω.

Given a set S, if the set O of orbits of a permutation group G acts diagonally and componentwise on S^2 to form an association scheme (S, O), then the scheme (S, O) is called a *permutation group scheme*. This arises if and only if (S, O) has a transitive automorphism group. J. D. H. Smith has given a higher-dimensional analogue of an association scheme called a *superscheme* which arises as the set of componentwise orbits on direct powers of S, of a transitive multiplicity-free permutation group G acting on S. The group and its action are recovered from the Bose-Mesner superalgebra of the superscheme, which is a 'quantised' version of a Krasner (relation) algebra of the second kind.

Another direction of research which is relevant here is that concerning *clones*. A *clone* on a set A is a collection of finitary operations on A that contains the projection operations and is closed under composition. Clones are generalizations of monoids, considered as a set of selfmaps of the domain set which is closed under composition and contains the identity mapping. For any set F of operations on A, the clone $[F]$ generated by F is the collection of all *term operations* of the algebra $\mathbb{A} = \langle A; F \rangle$, which is also called the *clone of* $\mathbb{A}$. There

is a Galois connection between the lattice of clones on a set A and $\mathrm{Sym}(A)$ that is determined by the relation that a permutation conjugates a clone onto itself. The Galois closed sets on the clone side are the lattices of all clones that are closed under conjugation by all members of some permutation group. More on this can be found in the survey paper of Á. Szendrei [**511**]. Bodirsky and Pinsker have initiated a study of clones [**51**] pertinent to random graph theory by studying the lattice of closed transformation monoids, and more generally clones closed under composition, that contain $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

(19) *Links Between Switching and Named Groups.* The switching group $C_2 \,\mathrm{Wr}\, \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ occurs in many guises in such areas as matroid theory and Lie algebras as we now briefly recall.

We briefly indicate when the (slightly redefined from its appearance in Chapter 2) *extended switching groups* defined by $S^e_{2,n} := S_{2,n+1} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ and acting on the set of 2-coloured n-vertex random graphs may be isomorphic to hyperoctahedral groups which we denote $\mathrm{Hyp}(n)$.

The hyperoctahedral groups are special cases of groups that arise in graph theory due to the fact that if Γ_c is a connected graph, then $\mathrm{Aut}(k\Gamma_c) = \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_c) \,\mathrm{Wr}\, \mathrm{Sym}(k)$, $k > 1$ [**261**]. They also arise in studies of matroid automorphisms via signed graphs [**214**]. The n-dimensional hypercube can be regarded as a graph whose vertex set consists of 0's and 1's of length n. The group $\mathrm{Hyp}(n)$ is the automorphism group of this hypercube and can be represented by the group of signed permutations, that is vertex permutations of the hypercube which preserve adjacency.

The origin of $\mathrm{Hyp}(n)$ is as the Weyl group $B_n := 2^n \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ associated with one of four families of complex simple Lie algebras also denoted B_n. The hyperoctahedral group is the automorphism group of the root lattice of the Lie group B_n with roots $\pm e_i$ and $\pm e_i \pm e_j$ for $1 \le i < j \le n$. This group has the presentation $\langle s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_{n-1} | s_i^2 = 1 \ \forall \ i,\ s_i s_j = s_j s_i$ if $|i-j| > 1, s_i s_{i+1} s_i = s_{i+1} s_i s_{i+1}$ if $i \ge 1,$ and $s_1 s_0 s_1 s_0 = s_0 s_1 s_0 s_1 \rangle$.

Given the B_n Coxeter-Dynkin diagram ($n \ge 2$)

$$\circ_0^{e_1} \Longleftarrow \circ_1^{e_2-e_1} \text{——} \circ_2^{e_3-e_2} \text{——} \ldots \circ_{n-2}^{e_{n-1}-e_{n-2}} \text{——} \circ_{n-1}^{e_n-e_{n-1}}$$

then s_i is the reflection in the hyperplane perpendicular to the vector labelling the ith node. Since the angle between e_1 and

$e_2 - e_1$ is 135°, the angle between $e_i - e_{i-1}$ and $e_{i+1} - e_i$ is 120°, and all other angles are 90°, the orders of $s_0 s_1$, $s_{i-1} s_i$ $(i \geq 2)$ and $s_i s_j$ $(|i-j| > 1)$ are 4, 3, and 2 respectively, giving the stated relations.

One way to view B_n [**5**] is as a subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Sym}(1, \ldots, n, \overline{1}, \ldots, \overline{n})$ such that for $h \in B_n$, $\overline{h(i)} = h(\overline{i})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. So $B_n = \langle s_0 = (1\ \overline{1}), s_i = (i\ i+1)(\overline{i}\ \overline{i+1}), (i = 1, \ldots, n-1) \rangle$. The base group 2^n is generated by s_0 and its conjugates in $\mathrm{Sym}(n) = \langle s_1, \ldots, s_{n-1} \rangle$ given by $(2\ \overline{2}) = (1\overline{1})^{s_1}, (3\ \overline{3}) = (2\ \overline{2})^{s_2}, \ldots$.

The Weyl group of interest to us is $D_n := 2^{n-1} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n) = \langle s_1 s_0 s_1 s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_{n-1} \rangle$.

The elementary abelian group $2^{n-1} = \langle t_i = (i\ \overline{i})(i+1\ \overline{i+1}) \rangle$ $(1 \leq i \leq n-1)$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(n) = \langle s_1, \ldots, s_{n-1} \rangle$ acts on the t_i generators by conjugation, for example $t_1^{s_2} = (1\ \overline{1})(2\ \overline{2})^{s_2} = (1\ \overline{1})(3\ \overline{3}) = t_1 t_2$. Notice that regarding $B_n \leq \mathrm{Sym}(2n)$ gives $D_n = B_n \cap \mathrm{Alt}(2n)$.

The D_n action on $2^{n-1} = \{(a_1, \ldots, a_n) |\ a_i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ is via conjugation, permuting the places. Switching changes vertex *pairs* so we are restricted to considering n is odd so that $n-1$ is even.

In conclusion $S^e_{2,n}$ and D_n are dual $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ modules that are isomorphic and have structure $2^{n-1} \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ if and only if n is odd. Further we can only have as $(n-1)$-tuples $(0, \ldots, 0)$ and $(1, \ldots, 1)$ in the base module of D_n.

A *pseudo-reflection* [**465**] of a vector space over $\mathbb{C}$ is a finite order automorphism (not necessarily order 2) whose fixed point set is a hyperplane. The irreducible complex reflection groups classified by Shephard and Todd [**489**] are two infinite series $\mathrm{Sym}(n+1)$ and $G(p, q, n)$ $(p > 1, q \geq 1, n \geq 1$ and $q|p)$ and 34 exceptional groups. The group $G(p, 1, n) = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^n \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ is the group of $n \times n$ monomial matrices with pth roots of unity as non-zero entries, where $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ is the subgroup of permutation matrices and $(\mathbb{Z}_p)^n$ is the subgroup of diagonal matrices. Letting $s_0 = \mathrm{diag}(\zeta, 1, \ldots, 1)$, where ζ is a primitive pth root of unity and $s_i = (i\ i+1)$ gives that $G(p, 1, n)$ is generated by the pseudo-reflections $\{s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_{n-1}\}$ satisfying:

$$\text{braid relations} = \begin{cases} s_0 s_1 s_0 s_1 = s_1 s_0 s_1 s_0 & \\ s_i s_j = s_j s_i & \text{if } |i-j| > 1 \\ s_i s_{i+1} s_i = s_{i+1} s_i s_{i+1} & \text{for } i \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

$$\text{finite order relations} = \begin{cases} s_0^p = 1 \\ s_i^2 = 1 \quad \text{for } i \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

So $G(2,1,n) = B_n$ $(n \geq 2)$ and $G(2,2,n) = D_n$ $(n \geq 3)$. So for odd n, $S^e_{2,n}$ is isomorphic to a complex reflection group.

Investigate further the links between switching groups and other known groups. One example of a welding of two types of groups is [**213**] which contains a study of the subgroup of the automorphism group of the free group generated by the braid group and the permutation group.

(20) *Switchings of $\mathbb{L}_L$ Roots.* A lattice in a real d-dimensional vector space is *Euclidean* or *Lorentzian* if the overlying vector space is Euclidean, $\mathbb{R}^d$, or Minkowski, $\mathbb{R}^{d-1,1}$. Even Lorentzian lattices, $II^{d-1,1}$, exist only in dimensions $d = 8n+2$, n an integer, and are defined as consisting of those x for which (i) either $x \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1,1}$ or $x - l \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1,1}$ and (ii) $x \cdot l \in \mathbb{Z}$ where $l = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \ldots, \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2})$. If $\mathbb{L}$ is a Euclidean even self-dual lattice, then $\mathbb{L} \oplus II^{1,1} = II^{8n+1,1}$, where $\dim \mathbb{L} = 8n$. It has been proven [**156**] that a set of simple roots of the even Lorentzian lattice $II^{25,1}$ is a set of points that are isometric to the Leech lattice. (A set of simple roots is a minimal set of vectors having the property that the reflections in the hyperplanes perpendicular to them generate the Weyl group of the lattice, that is the group of all reflections which are automorphisms of the lattice). In short, there is a Lorentzian form for $\mathbb{L}_L$ that lies in the even integral unimodular lattice $II_{25,1}$ [**157**, Chapters 26, 27, 30].

The lattice $II_{25,1}$ contains a set of vectors that are isometric to the $\mathbb{L}_L$ under the metric $d(r,s)^2 = N(r-s)$, where

$$x \cdot y = x_0 y_o + \ldots + x_{n-1} y_{n-1} - x_n y_n, \quad N(x) = x \cdot x.$$

The reflection subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(II_{25,1})$ is the Coxeter group with a generator R_r for each $\mathbb{L}_L$ vector r presented by

$$\begin{aligned} (R_r)^2 &= 1, \\ (R_r R_s)^2 &= 1 \quad \text{if } N(r-s) = 4, \\ (R_r R_s)^3 &= 1 \quad \text{if } N(r-s) = 6. \end{aligned}$$

The group of all autochronous automorphisms (those not interchanging the positive and negative time cones) of $II_{25,1}$ is this Coxeter group generated by reflections in the Leech roots extended by the group Co_∞ of its diagram automorphisms. The direct product of this extension and a central inversion -1 gives the group $\mathrm{Aut}(II_{25,1})$. The group of graph automorphisms

($\cong \mathrm{Co}_\infty$) transitively permutes the walls of the fundamental region for the Coxeter group (which are in 1–1 correspondence with the Leech roots); it is the group of all automorphisms of $\mathbb{L}_L$, including translations. Does the above Coxeter subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(II_{25,1})$ correspond to a specifiable subgroup of $S_{3,\omega}$?

(21) *Switchings in Other Areas.* This is a general question. Where in mathematics, other than in graph theory, do switching operations and switching groups arise?

(22) *Kac-Moody algebras.* A graph is *N-free* if it does not contain the path of length 3 as an induced subgraph. Let $c(n)$ be the number of connected N-free graphs on n vertices.

Then the following identity holds:

$$\prod_{n>0}(1-q^n)^{-c(n)} = 1 - q + 2\sum_{n>0} c(n)q^n$$

This somewhat resembles in form the denominator identity of a Kac-Moody Lie algebra. Is there is a nice connection? (For each N-free graph there is a complementary one, so there is a bijection between connected and disconnected N-free graphs).

There may be an approach to solving this problem using the theory of free Lie algebras [**70**].

Another clue may be found in the formula that generates the number of unlabeled, rooted trees [**554**]. A *rooted tree* is a tree whose vertices are unlabeled, except a distinguished one which is the 'root'. If $h(n)$ is the number of all rooted forests on n vertices, then

$$\sum_n h(n)x^n = \prod_{n>0}(1-x^n)^{-t(n)},$$

where $t(n) = h(n,1)$ is the number of rooted trees of n vertices. Then since the number of rooted forests on n vertices equals the number of rooted trees on $n+1$ vertices, the formula becomes

$$\sum_n t(n+1)x^n = \prod_{n>0}(1-x^n)^{-t(n)}.$$

Another occurrence of a similar identity, arising in the study of integer sequences [**89**]. Suppose that $x = (x_n)$ enumerates a class C, and the operator S is defined on the set of sequences of non-negative integers by $Sx = (y_n)$ such that

$$\prod_{n>0}(1-t^n)^{-x_n} = 1 + \sum_{n>0} y_n t^n.$$

Then Sx enumerates the class of disjoint unions of members of C where, for Sx, the order of the "component" members of C is unimportant, for example, building a structure such as a graph from its connected components. If x enumerates the generators (homogeneous elements) of a graded algebra that is a polynomial ring, them Sx gives the dimensions of the homogeneous components. If x is realized by a group G then Sx is realized by $G \operatorname{Wr} S$. Finally from the same paper [**89**], if x lists the dimensions of homogeneous components of a graded vector space V, then S lists those of the symmetric algebra of V and the operator S^* defined by

$$\prod_{n>0}(1+t^n)^{x_n} = 1 + \sum_{n>0}(S^*x)_n t^n$$

lists those of the exterior algebra of V.

Finally we mention a reference to the Hopf algebra of rooted trees [**73**], and one on pre-Lie algebras and rooted trees [**137**] (the free pre-Lie algebra on one generator has a basis given by rooted trees).

(23) *Unified Triality.* Consider the following trialities:

(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)



(a) We can step down from $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ to one of the three $\mathfrak{R}$s by going colourblind in any two of the three colours of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$.

(b) $\mathbb{L}_L$ is the Leech lattice and $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ is the E_8 lattice. That three of the latter embed in one of the former, is clear from Lemma 6.12. Two lattices $\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{L}'$ are *isomorphic* if there is an orthogonal automorphism $u \in O(n, \mathbb{R})$ with $u(\mathbb{L}) = \mathbb{L}'$. If $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{L}'$ then u is an *automorphism* of the lattice. One further definition is worth stating as it mimics the homogeneity property of random graphs: two overlattices $\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{L}'$ of a lattice Λ are *isomorphic* if there is an automorphism of Λ extending to an isomorphism of $\mathbb{L}$ with $\mathbb{L}'$.

Modulo suitable normalization, $|\mathbb{L}_L/\mathbb{L}_{E_8}| = (2^8)^3$ [**354**].

In general, the root system of a lattice $\mathbb{L}$ spans a sublattice $\overline{\mathbb{L}}$ which has finite index in $\mathbb{L}$ [**395**, p. 139]. In 24 dimensions the only exception is $\mathbb{L}_L$ having $\overline{\mathbb{L}_L} = 0$. Furthermore, usually $\det(\overline{\mathbb{L}}) > 1$ so that $\overline{\mathbb{L}}$ is a proper sublattice of $\mathbb{L}$. This also has one exception, namely $\mathbb{L} = \overline{\mathbb{L}} = \mathbb{L}_{E_8} \oplus \mathbb{L}_{E_8} \oplus \mathbb{L}_{E_8}$, with root system $E_8 \oplus E_8 \oplus E_8$.

(c) The outer automorphisms of Spin(8) are the original well-known triality discovered by É. Cartan in 1925, though with a geometric predecessor from 1903 due to E. Study.

(d) This refers to Grishkov's work [**256**] on *Lie algebras* L *with triality*; see Appendix 14.

Other than the 23 constructions of the Leech lattice based on a Niemeier lattice, there is also the Turyn construction using three copies of the $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$, which follows the way that the binary Golay code can be constructed using three copies of the extended Hamming code, $H(8)$. There are no doubt other examples, perhaps in fields such as design theory, Steiner triple systems and elsewhere; see Appendix 13.

The substructures in our four above cases are not merely unions; a disjoint union of graphs is different to a direct sum of lattices, the latter being more like a transversal of graphs. There are already approaches that connect some of the structures, such as [**240**] where two infinite families of locally 3-arc transitive graphs are constructed which have $\mathrm{Aut}(P\Omega^+(8, q))$

as their automorphism group. It is possible to argue that of the structures, the graph is the most basic. Is there an ingredient or theory that describes the common form of the structures?

We already have some connections, which are summarized in Figure 5. Here, $\mathbb{L}_L$ is the *local* object corresponding to the global object $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. Note also that $\mathrm{SL}(2,2) \cong \mathrm{PSL}(2,2)$ and is its own Schur cover. We list some associated open questions.

Conjecture 1 *Main Conjecture.* We conjecture that it is possible to relate all these occurrences of triality, but the central question is how to prove this? We already have some connections indicated in Figure 5, but is there an ingredient or theory that describes the common form of these structures?

Conjecture 2 *Local-Global Connection.* The lattice $\mathbb{L}_L$ is the *local* object corresponding to the global object $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. Can we construct a Lie algebra with triality $T(L)$ to be the *local* object corresponding to the global object comprising of the dense locally finite subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$?

A significant missing piece of the puzzle is how to link a purported Lie algebra $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{L})$ to the triality graph $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$.

There are many approaches that connect some of the structures, such as Liebeck's [**355**] which connects Lie algebras, two-graphs and permutation groups. This may be a potential starting point. In particular, is there a Liebeck Lie algebra on three colours having the form $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{L}) = \mathsf{L}^{(2)}{}_1 \oplus \mathsf{L}^{(2)}{}_2 \oplus \mathsf{L}^{(2)}{}_3$, where $\mathsf{L}^{(2)}{}_i$ are isomorphic to a Liebeck-type Lie algebra on two colours?

Take a finite graph $\Gamma = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$, in which $N(v_i)$ denotes the neighbour set of vertex v_i, and suppose that K is a field in which $|N(v_i)| - |N(v_j)| = 0$ for all i, j. Define an algebra over K with basis $\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$; Liebeck defines for $v_i, v_j \in V(\Gamma)$

$$v_i v_j := \sum N(v_i) - \sum N(v_j),$$

that is the difference of the formal sums of neighbour sets of the vertices. In characteristic zero, this Lie algebra derived from a regular graph is only nilpotent if Γ is the null graph.

This definition, where the infinite sums are taken to have coefficients 1 if the summed vertex is a neighbour and 0 if it is a non-neighbour, does not readily extend to infinite graphs, so perhaps we can try a Lie algebra derived from field-valued functions on the vertices.

We would first need to check the following properties are true of vertices in $\mathfrak{R}$ and $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$:-

(1) Is a Lie bracket satisfied?

(2) Does triality act in the right way, for example σ effects $\mathfrak{b} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}$, and ρ effects $\mathfrak{b} \to \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{r} \to \mathfrak{b}$ on edges in $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$?

(3) Does the 3-colour case reduce to the 2-colour case?

(4) Is the Lie algebra triality identity satisfied?

Conjecture 3 *Moufang Loops and Octonion Algebras.* All octonion algebras satisfy the Moufang property so their loops of units are Moufang loops. (In particular, the norm 1 split-octonions over K give rise to the triality group $P\Omega^+(8, K) \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(3)$.) Conversely, every known nonassociative simple Moufang loop, finite or infinite, arises as the central quotient of the norm 1 units from some octonion algebra [**267**]. Is this true of the Moufang loop constructed in Theorem 6.27, and how exactly does this connect $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ with the octonions?

Conjecture 4 *Connection to $D_4(K)$.* There is a conjecture that a simple (infinite) group G admits non-trivial triality $\langle \sigma, \rho \rangle$ if and only if $G \cong D(4, K)$, where K is a field, and $\langle \sigma, \rho \rangle$ is the group of graph automorphisms of G. Grishkov and A. V. Zavarnitsine make the following comment about this conjecture [**258**]: "This conjecture is both important and difficult. The only encouraging fact is that the corresponding problem for simple Lie algebras with triality was solved in the affirmative (see [**256**])".

Conjecture 5 *Simple Centralizing Groups.* This conjecture is due to Nagy and P. Vojtěchovský [**409**]. If G is a simple group with triality $S = \langle \sigma, \rho \rangle$ such that $G = [G, S]$ and $\zeta_S(G) = 1$, then $C_G(\sigma) = \{x \in G : x^\sigma = x\}$ and $C_G(\rho) = \{x \in G : x^\rho = x\}$ are simple groups.

Conjecture 6 *Different Approaches to Triality.* Is there different approach that explicitly uses Clifford algebras?

If so, can our lattice constructions of random graphs be applied to the formation by Wilson [**556**] of a 3-dimensional octonionic Leech lattice as the set of triples of octonions satisfying certain conditions, where the definition of the lattice is invariant under permutations of the three coordinates. We note other attempts to build the Leech lattice from triples of integral octonions including [**173**] [**174**] [**193**]; each of these can potentially be related to our work.

A second plan of attack in proving the connection would be to adapt to our situation the theory of F. Zara [**560**] who has shown how to construct Clifford algebras of Coxeter groups

which are connected to Fischer systems and in turn to connected graphs. In our case the group in question is the 3-transposition group generated by the three types of switchings associated with $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, and the connected graph is the affine diagram $\tilde{A}_2$, this being the smallest diagram *not* associated with a finite Coxeter group, with the switchings acting upon or representing the vertices.

A third possible approach would be to construct $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ using the definition of the icosian ring discovered by P. L. H. Brooke and given in [**556**, p.160], which we now repeat. Let V be the 4-dimensional rational vector space spanned by vectors G, H, I, J, K (permuted by Alt(5)) subject to $G+H+I+J+K = 0$, with inner products $(X, X) = 2, (X, Y) = -\frac{1}{2}$ for $X \neq Y$. The Clifford algebra $CA(V)$ is the quotient of the tensor algebra $1 \oplus V \oplus V^2 \oplus \ldots$ by the ideal $\langle v \otimes w + w \otimes v - 2(v, w) \rangle$ and has two 8-dimensional subalgebras over $\mathbb{Q}$. It has an even subalgebra that is the image of $1 \oplus V^2 \oplus V^4$ and isomorphic to the icosian ring, and an odd algebra that is the image of $V \oplus V^3$.

Conjecture 7 *Ternary Quasigroups & the Modular Group.* In [**498**], J. D. H. Smith unified the two definitions of n-quasigroups, the combinatorial one (amounting to Latin n-cubes), and the one given by $2n$ identities on $n+1$ different n-ary operations, under the name of *hyperquasigroup*. The combinatorial definition is a set Q with an n-ary multiplication $\mu : Q^n \to Q : (x_n, \ldots, x_1) \mapsto x_n \ldots x_1 \mu$ such that, specification of any n coordinates in an $(n+1)$-tuple satisfying $x_n \ldots x_1 \mu = x_0$ determines the remaining one uniquely. For the free product groups defined by $M_n := \langle \xi, \sigma | \xi^n = 1 = \sigma^2 \rangle$, where $M_1 = C_2$, $M_2 = D_\infty$, $M_3 = \mathrm{PSL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$, ..., there is an epimorphism $r : M_n \to \mathrm{Sym}(n+1) : \xi \mapsto (1\ 2\ \ldots\ n), \sigma \mapsto (0\ 1)$. Smith defines an *$n$-space* (G, ξ, σ) to be a set G with a shift ξ and an involution σ, such that $\xi : G \to G : g \mapsto \xi g$, $\sigma : G \to G : g \mapsto \sigma g$. Then $\mathrm{Sym}(4) = \langle \xi, \sigma | \xi^3 = \sigma^2 = (\xi\sigma)^4 = 1 \rangle$ is a ternary space, where $\xi = (1\ 2\ 3)$ and $\sigma = (0\ 1)$ are left multiplications within Sym(4). Smith shows that ternary quasigroups arise from actions of the modular group. Can this be linked to our construction of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ as a homogenous Cayley graph for the index-3 subgroup $C_2 * C_2 * C_2$ of the modular group? Smith extended his work in [**499**] where his hyperquasigroups were characterized in terms of graphs, and the Sym(3)-triality action was implemented in terms of the hyperquasigroups.



FIGURE 5. Diagram of Some Known Connections Related to Triality

(24) *Arnold's Trinities.* Are there connections with Arnolds programme of connecting *trinities* that arise in different parts of mathematics, for example his attempt [**16**] to colour braid groups and complexify and quaternionize permutation groups? Is there an analytical representation of permutations that can be analytically continued into the complex plane, perhaps via topological groups?

(25) *Triality of* $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. As an extension of Theorem 6.17, investigate the possibility of a *dense locally finite* subgroup G of the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ such that $(G, T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}))$ is a group with triality, with $T(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$.

(26) *Connection with modular group* $(\beth)$ *action on* $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$. It is well-known that $\mathfrak{R}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ have many links, for instance model-theoretic homogeneity, $\aleph_0$-categoricity, a topology on $\mathfrak{R}$ that is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}$ with the usual metric topology. Also $\mathbb{Q}$ is a direct limit of infinite cyclic groups and $\mathfrak{R}$ is a Cayley graph for C_∞. The class of finite ordered graphs has as Fraïssé limit the random graph with an appropriate linear ordering isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}$, which might be called the *random ordered graph* [**326**]. Finally, Bodirsky and Pinsker studied [**51**] the random ordered graph in which the vertex set is equipped with a total order to yield the unique countably infinite homogeneous graph containing all finite ordered graphs. The order is then isomorphic to the order of the rationals. Incidentally, Bodirsky, Pinsker and Pongrácz determined up to first-order interdefinability, the 42 reducts of the random ordered graph, this being the *free superposition* (defined in the paper [**52**]) of $(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ and the random graph, giving the unique countable homogeneous linearly ordered graph that embeds all finite linearly ordered graphs up to isomorphism. This result is connected to the Kechris-Pestov-Todorcevic theorem in topological dynamics [**326**]; see § 4 of the Prerequisite Background Appendices.

Is there a connection between modular group action on $\mathfrak{R}$ and that on $\hat{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$?

For the reader's convenience we make some notes. G. Jones and co-workers found [**315**] that the action of $\beth$ on $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$ where by convention $g \in \beth : \infty \mapsto a/c$ and $a/c = \infty$ if $c = 0$ is transitive, and that the stabilizer of a point is $C_\infty = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$, which might be made to tally with the regular action of C_∞ on $\mathfrak{R}$ if it

stabilizes one colour in $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. Now if $\beth_\infty$ denotes the stabilizer of ∞ then subgroups H such that $\beth_\infty < H \leq \beth$ produce $\beth$-invariant equivalence relations on $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Letting $\approx_n$ denote the $\beth$-invariant equivalence relation induced on $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$ by the congruence subgroups $\beth_0(n)$, it was found that for $p_1, p_2 \in \hat{\mathbb{Q}}$, $p_1 \approx_n p_2$ if and only if $p_1 - p_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$, that is p_1, p_2 have the same reduction $(\mathrm{mod}\ n)$. For example for $H = \beth_0(n)$, the inclusion $H \leq \beth$ is strict if $n > 1$, so $\beth$ acts imprimitively on $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$, the number of equivalence classes being $|\beth : \beth_0(n)|$. When n is a prime p, there are $p+1$ blocks. The action of $\beth$ on the blocks is the same as that of its quotient group $\mathrm{PSL}(2, p)$ on the projective line $GF(p) \cup \{\infty\}$. For $p = 2$, $\beth$ acts as $\mathrm{PSL}(2, 2) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ on the blocks of imprimitivity $[0], [1]$ and $[\infty]$, where $[a]$ denotes the block containing point a, and $[\infty] = \{x/y \in \hat{\mathbb{Q}} \mid y \equiv 0 \pmod{n}\}$.

Now take an infinite trivalent graph and label its vertices by those elements $p_i \in \hat{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that for each pair $p_i, p_j \in \hat{\mathbb{Q}}$ satisfying $p_i \approx_n p_j$ form the edge $\{p_i, p_j\}$. Firstly, prove that $\beth$-invariance is equivalent to a regular group action on graph vertices. The $\beth$-invariant equivalence relation $\approx_2$ is then the stabilization of an edge rather than an edge colour. Show that colouring the edges at random from $\{\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}\}$ taking $p = 2$ means that $\beth$ acts as $\mathrm{PSL}(2, 2) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ on the colours and as $\beth_0(2)$ on the vertices. By Theorem 4.2.5(2) of [**396**] $\beth_0(2)$ has index 3 in $\beth$ and so is the unique such group, so $\beth_0(2) \cong C_2 * C_2 * C_2$, therefore $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ can be a Cayley graph for $\beth_0(2)$.

Another way to see the link is as follows [**312**]. Let $\beth = \langle X, Y | X^2 = 1 = Y^3 \rangle$ where X and Y are the images in $\beth$ of the matrices $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. If G is a subgroup of index n in $\beth$, then $\beth$ acts transitively on the coset space $\beth/G$. Let the element $Z = (XY)^{-1} = \pm \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ have t cycles where t is called the *parabolic class number* of G. Now t is equal to the number of orbits of G on $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}$, and also equal to the number of G–conjugacy classes of maximal parabolic subgroups in G. Since C_3 is abelian, its order equals the number of its conjugacy classes.

(27) *Connection with Conway's work on* $\beth_0(n)$. If we consider the upper half complex plane then $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ can be represented as a

random 3-colouring of a tree whose leaves are the non-infinite edges of the fundamental regions for the action of $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$. Can we use this observation, together with Conway's work [**153**] to help formulate some links between $\mathfrak{R}^t$ and the modular group?

We mention some elements of his work. Two groups or lattices are *commensurable* if their intersection has finite index in each of them.

The *commensurability subgroup* of $H < G$ is defined by $\mathrm{Comm}_G(H) := \{g \in G | g^{-1}Hg \text{ and } H \text{ are commensurable}\}$.

If $H_1, H_2 < G$ are commensurable, then $\mathrm{Comm}_G(H_1) = \mathrm{Comm}_G(H_2)$. Note the following subgroup inclusions: $H \leq N_G(H) \leq \mathrm{Comm}_G(H) \leq G$. The modular group $\mathfrak{Z}$ is the automorphism group of a 2-dimensional fiducial lattice, call it $\mathbb{L}_1 = \langle \underline{e}_1, \underline{e}_2 \rangle$ acting on it by matrix multiplication, that is change of basis. Conway studied the groups commensurable with $\mathfrak{Z}$, for example the congruence subgroups $\mathfrak{Z}_0(n)$, in terms of their actions on the lattices commensurable with $\mathbb{L}_1$.

In a *projective class* of lattices, $\langle \lambda\underline{e}_1, \lambda\underline{e}_2 \rangle$ and $\langle \underline{e}_1, \underline{e}_2 \rangle$ are equivalent for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}\backslash\{0\}$. For each integer n, $\mathbb{L}_1$ and $\mathbb{L}_n = \langle n\underline{e}_1, \underline{e}_2 \rangle$ each contain a rescaled copy of the other to index n. For each projective class assign a node of a $(p+1)$-valent tree, with joins corresponding to containments at prime index. The stabilizer of any point is a conjugate of $\mathfrak{Z}$, and the joint stabilizer of $\mathbb{L}_1$ and $\mathbb{L}_n$ is $\mathfrak{Z}_0(n)$. Any two commensurable lattices can by a basis change become $\mathbb{L}_1$ and $\mathbb{L}_n$ for some n and some conjugate of $\mathfrak{Z}_0(n)$ stabilizes any two commensurable lattices. A graph can be formed by joining each pair of lattices commensurable with $\mathbb{L}_1 = \langle \underline{e}_1, \underline{e}_2 \rangle$ by a line. Finally, both $\mathfrak{Z}_0(n)$ and its normalizer in $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ are relevant to the moonshine properties of Thomson series, and are required to describe monstrous moonshine.

(28) *Almost Stabilizer of* $\mathfrak{R}$. We will motivate and at the end state the open problem.

We mention at the outset some permutational similarities between $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q},<)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$: they are both oligomorphic on their domains, primitive, transitive, and not even 2-transitive. The differences include that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q},<)$ is both torsion-free and highly homogeneous, whilst $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is not.

Macpherson has a construction of maximal subgroups of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q},<)$ [**375**, p.265]. Maximal subgroups of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ include

stabilizers of finite sets of vertices, unordered edges and unordered non-edges. (Observe that two obvious non-conjugate maximal subgroups of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q},<)$ are the stabilizers of a rational and of an irrational; maximality of these groups follows from the primitivity of the corresponding permutation representations [**375**, p.266]).

A collection $\mathscr{I}$ of subsets of a countably infinite set Ω is an *ideal* if

(a) $\varnothing \in \mathscr{I}, \Omega \notin \mathscr{I}$;

(b) if $T \in \mathscr{I}$ and $S \subseteq T$ then $S \in \mathscr{I}$;

(c) if $T, S \in \mathscr{I}$ then $T \cup S \in \mathscr{I}$.

An ideal $\mathscr{I}$ is *maximal* if it is contained in no larger ideal; that is, for every $S \subset \Omega$, either $S \in \mathscr{I}$ or $\Omega \backslash S \in \mathscr{I}$. Every ideal $\mathscr{I}$ has a dual *filter*, $\mathscr{F} := \{\Omega \backslash S : S \in \mathscr{I}\}$, and vice versa, and so the stabilizer of an ideal is the same as the stabilizer of a filter. The dual of a maximal ideal is an *ultrafilter*. If $\mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ and Ω is not a finite union of members of $\mathscr{H}$, then the closure of $\mathscr{H}$ under subsets and finite unions is the ideal $\langle \mathscr{H} \rangle$ *generated by* $\mathscr{H}$ and is the smallest ideal containing $\mathscr{H}$.

With this notation we have the following two definitions:-

$$S_{\{\mathscr{H}\}} := \{g \in \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega) : (\forall T \subseteq \Omega)(T \in \mathscr{H} \leftrightarrow T^g \in \mathscr{H})\}.$$

$$S_{(\mathscr{I})} := \{g \in \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega) : \mathrm{supp}(g) \in \mathscr{I}\}.$$

Macpherson proved the following result as an extension of a theorem of Richman [**460**], (see Appendix 1):

11.7. Theorem. *Let $\mathscr{I}$ be an ideal on Ω containing a moiety. If $S_{\{\mathscr{I}\}}$ has three orbits on moieties of Ω, then $S_{\{\mathscr{I}\}}$ is maximal in* $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$.

If $\Omega = \mathbb{Q}$ then one ideal that satisfies this theorem consists of all *scattered* suborderings of $\mathbb{Q}$, that is, subsets which do not themselves embed a copy of $(\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$ [**375**].

Covington, Macpherson and Mekler, who were interested in ideals whose stabilizer is maximal, then proved [**161**]

11.8. Theorem. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a countably infinite indivisible homogeneous structure over a finite relational language, let $\Omega = M$ and $S = \mathrm{Sym}(M)$, and assume that $S \neq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$. Define an ideal $\mathscr{I}$ to be the set of subsets $A \subseteq M$ such that the structure induced on A does not embed a copy of $\mathcal{M}$. Then*

(a) *$\mathscr{I}$ is an ideal on Ω;*

(b) *$\mathscr{I}$ contains a moiety of Ω;*
(c) *if the age $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ has the strong amalgamation property (SAP) then $S_{\{\mathscr{I}\}}$ has three orbits on moieties of Ω so is maximal in* $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$.

(A recent study has been made [**348**] in which a countable dimensional vector space over an $\mathbb{Q}$ provides an example of an age indivisible, but not weakly indivisible relational structure.)

In [**72**] and [**375**], non-maximal ideals are constructed, whose stabilizers $S_{\{\mathscr{I}\}}$ are maximal in $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$. In [**161**] more such ideals were given, where the ideal was related to combinatorial structures with domain Ω, such as $(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ and $\mathfrak{R}$. The ideal is invariant under the automorphism group of the structure, and the associated maximal subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ can be viewed as an *almost stabilizer* of the structure, that is a group of *almost automorphisms* of the structure. The last theorem applies to $\mathfrak{R}$ and to Henson graphs.

By way of studying the extent to which non-isomorphic structures yield non-conjugate maximal subgroups, the following question has been asked [**161**]: is it possible to put the structure of the random graph on $\mathbb{Q}$ so that the maximal subgroup almost stabilizing $(\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$ is equal to the almost stabilizer of the random graph, in the present sense?

(29) *Random Cyclic Metric Space.* A countable metric space admitting a cyclic automorphism permuting the points in a single cycle is specified by a function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ which satisfies

$$max_{x<n}(|f(x) - f(n-x)|) \leq f(n) \leq min_{y<n}(f(y) + f(n-y)).$$

(Identify the vertex set with $\mathbb{Z}$ and set $d(x, y) = f(|x-y|)$.) Assume that the values of $d(x, y)$ for $x \neq y$ lie in the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$. If we choose $f(n)$ for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, the displayed inequalities never conflict. Suppose that we choose $f(n)$ randomly from the allowed values. What can be said about the resulting 'random cyclic metric space'? (For $d = 2$ we obtain the path metric in the countable random graph $\mathfrak{R}$: see [**453**]).

(30) *Limits of cubes.* The celebrated Urysohn space is the completion of a countable universal homogeneous metric space which can itself be built as a direct limit of finite metric spaces. In the paper [**126**], other examples are given of spaces constructed by forming the direct limit and completion, where the finite spaces are scaled hypercubes. The resulting countable spaces provide

a context for a direct limit of finite symmetric groups with strictly diagonal embeddings (see [**342**]), acting naturally on a module which additively is the "Nim field" [**154**] (the quadratic closure of the field of order 2). Its completion is familiar in another guise: it is the set of Lebesgue-measurable subsets of the unit interval modulo null sets with distance being the Lebesgue measure of the symmetric difference. The isometry groups of these spaces are described as well as some interesting subgroups, and some generalizations are given. Here we include some of the problems for further research that are in the mentioned paper.

(i) The union of a chain of scaled hypercubes is the space $\mathcal{H}_\omega$, and this is represented on the set of non-negative integers by a recursively defined function. Is it possible to give an explicit non-recursive formula for this function?

(ii) **Cycles and Gray codes.** The space $\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{U}$ admits an isometry permuting all the points in a single cycle. It follows that Urysohn space $\mathfrak{U}$ has an isometry all of whose cycles are dense. See [**129**]. Does anything similar happen for the completion $\mathcal{H}$ of the infinite-dimensional cube $\mathcal{H}_\omega$?

It is tempting to think that, even if such isometries don't exist, the existence of Gray codes (that is, Hamiltonian cycles) in finite cubes should imply the existence of something similar in the limit spaces (perhaps something like a space-filling curve).

The space $\mathcal{H}$ cannot have a space-filling curve in the usual sense, since it is not compact. We do not know how to proceed.

A related question would be the existence of something like a space-filling curve in the "middle level" of $\mathcal{H}$, the set of points lying at distance $\frac{1}{2}$ from 0. Here, the existence of the analogous object in finite cubes is a difficult combinatorial problem, as yet unsolved (see [**310**]).

(iii) **Other Hamming spaces.** Let $H(n, q)$ denote the Hamming space consisting of all n-tuples over an alphabet of size q . As usual, the distance between two n-tuples is the number of coordinates where they differ. If we let $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ denote the scaled Hamming space $\frac{1}{n}H(n, q)$, then we have isometric embeddings

$$\mathcal{H}_1(q) \to \mathcal{H}_2(q) \to \mathcal{H}_4(q) \to \cdots$$

with union $\mathcal{H}_\omega(q)$ and completion $\mathcal{H}(q)$.

- Is there a convenient representation of $\mathcal{H}(q)$? What is the structure of its isometry group?
- Is it true that the set of points at distance 1 from any point of $\mathcal{H}(q)$ is isometric to $\mathcal{H}(q-1)$?
- If we modify the embedding to take $\mathcal{H}_{n_i}(q)$ to $\mathcal{H}_{n_{i+1}}(q)$, where $n_{i+1}/n_i = r_i$, with (r_i) any given sequence of integers greater than 1, is it the case that the completion of the union is isometric to $\mathcal{H}(q)$, independent of the choice of sequence (r_i)?

(iv) **Philip Hall's locally finite group.** Philip Hall [**264**] constructed a universal homogeneous locally finite group as follows. Embed $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ into $\mathrm{Sym}(n!)$ by its regular representation, and take the union of the sequence

$$\mathrm{Sym}(3) \to \mathrm{Sym}(6) \to \mathrm{Sym}(720) \to \cdots.$$

This group is countable and locally finite; it contains an isomorphic copy of every finite group, and any isomorphism between finite subgroups is induced by an inner automorphism of the group.

We can construct a limit of cubes to mirror this construction, so that Hall's group acts on the union. Consider $\mathcal{H}_n$, with the coordinates indexed $0, 1, \ldots, n-1$ as usual. We will take the coordinates of $\mathcal{H}_{n!}$ to be indexed by elements of $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$. Any subset S of $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ is mapped to the subset

$$\pi(S) = \{g \in \mathrm{Sym}(n) : 0^g \in S\}$$

of $\mathrm{Sym}(n!)$.

The embedding is an isometry, because $|\pi(S)|/n! = |S|/n$. Since

$$g \in \pi(S) \Leftrightarrow 0^g \in S \Leftrightarrow 0^{gh} \in S^h \Leftrightarrow gh \in \pi(S^h),$$

we have $\pi(S^h) = \pi(S)h$, and so π intertwines the natural action of $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ on $\{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ with its action on itself by right multiplication. Hence Hall's group acts on the union of this chain of cubes. We propose the name *Hall cube* for this space. Its completion is $\mathcal{H}$ (the construction above agrees with a more general construction given of $\mathcal{H}$).

What properties does the Hall cube have, and how does Hall's group act on it?

(v) **Other embeddings of metric spaces.** We can play the same game with other chains of finite metric spaces with

lots of symmetry (for example, scaled versions of distance-transitive graphs).

One example involves the *dual polar spaces* $D_n(K)$ of type D_n over a field K (see [**83**]). The points of such a space are the maximal totally singular subspaces of a vector space of dimension $2n$ over the field K carrying the quadratic form

$$Q(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{2n-1}) = x_0x_1 + x_2x_3 + \cdots + x_{2n-2}x_{2n-1}.$$

The distance between two subspaces is the codimension of their intersection. There is a natural embedding of $D_n(K)$ into $D_{n+1}(K)$, as the set of maximal totally singular subspaces containing a fixed 1-dimensional singular subspace. This embedding is the analogue of our embedding of $H(n, 2)$ into $H(n + 1, 2)$ without re-scaling.

A more interesting possibility would involve re-scaling, embedding $D_n(K)$ into $D_{2n}(K)$. One possibility would be to let $\overline{K}$ be a quadratic extension of K; then $D_n(K)$ is embedded in $D_n(\overline{K})$ (by tensoring the underlying vector space with $\overline{K}$), and $D_n(\overline{K})$ is embedded in $\frac{1}{2}D_{2n}(K)$ by restriction of scalars. This is a close analogue of the cubes considered in [**126**].

(31) *Urysohn space.*

Metric Space Theory. Prove the conjecture that

$$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}^m\mathfrak{U}) < \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{U}^{\mathbb{Z}^m}) < \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$$

where $\mathfrak{U}^{\mathbb{Z}^m}$ is the universal Urysohn space in which metrics take values in an m-coloured lattice $\mathbb{Z}^m$.

Isometries of $\mathfrak{U}$. Any isometry of the universal rational metric space $\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{U}$ can be extended to an isometry of its completion. There is an isometry σ of $\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{U}$ permuting all its points in a single cycle (analogous to the cyclic automorphism of the random graph). The isometry of $\mathfrak{U}$ induced by σ has the property that all its orbits are dense. The question is what other countable groups have this property? All that is known so far is that the elementary abelian 2-group has this property but the elementary abelian 3-group does not.

Abelian structure of $\mathfrak{U}$. The closure of $\langle\sigma\rangle$ is an abelian group acting transitively on $\mathfrak{U}$ (so $\mathfrak{U}$ has an abelian group structure). There are many such σ, and so the abelian group structure of $\mathfrak{U}$ is not canonical. What isomorphism types of abelian groups can occur as the closure of $\langle\sigma\rangle$? The closure of the countable elementary abelian 2-group with dense orbits is an elementary abelian 2-group acting transitively on $\mathfrak{U}$.

Subgroups of Isometries of $\mathfrak{U}$. It is possible to "randomly" construct isometries of $\mathfrak{U}$ in which every orbit is dense [**129**]. The closure $\overline{\mathrm{Iso}(\mathfrak{U})}$ of the group generated by such an isometry is abelian and transitive, and so gives the Urysohn space an abelian group structure. Can we make the choice such that $\overline{\mathrm{Iso}(\mathfrak{U})}$ has no non-trivial proper closed subgroup?

Ordered Metric Space Theory. Let Λ be an ordered abelian group. Is there a Λ-valued Urysohn space?

(32) *Two Galois Correspondences.* A pair $(^{\triangleright}, ^{\triangleleft})$ of maps $^{\triangleright} : P \to Q$ and $^{\triangleleft} : Q \to P$ between two ordered sets P and Q is a *Galois Connection* between P and Q if, $\forall p \in P, q \in Q$,

$$p^{\triangleright} \leq q \Leftrightarrow p \leq q^{\triangleleft}.$$

Whilst the two sets are usually defined to be posets, they can also be taken to be preorders, (that is reflexive and transitive binary relations) on a set [**164**, p. 173], as follows. Let $\leq_1$ and $\leq_2$ be two preorders on a set P such that $x \leq_1 y$ and $x \leq_2 y$ imply $x = y$. For $Y \subseteq P$ define,

$$Y^{\triangleright} := \{x \in P : (\forall y)(y \leq_1 x \Rightarrow y \notin Y)\},$$

$$Y^{\triangleleft} := \{x \in P : (\forall y)(y \leq_2 x \Rightarrow y \notin Y)\}.$$

Let $Q \subseteq P$; Q is a *down-set* of P if whenever $x \in Q$, $y \in P$ and $y \leq x$, we have $y \in Q$. The pair $(^{\triangleright}, ^{\triangleleft})$ establishes a Galois connection between the $\leq_1$-down-sets of P ordered by $\subseteq$ and the $\leq_2$-down-sets of P ordered by $\supseteq$.

The reason that we need to consider preorders, is that the relation $\Gamma_1 \to \Gamma_2$, where $\to$ means 'is homomorphic to', is a preorder on the class of graphs, but not a poset. The relation $\to$ is neither symmetric nor anti-symmetric [**263**].

Is there a possible application to the theory of monoids?

Consider finite transformation monoids on a fixed set of points with the graphs that can be defined on them, as we saw in a previous section.

Use $\subseteq$ to denote inclusion as submonoids and $\leq$ to denote subgraphs in the sense of homomorphisms. We know that $M_1 \subseteq M_2 \Rightarrow \mathrm{Gr}(M_2) \leq \mathrm{Gr}(M_1)$, because $v \sim w$ if $\nexists f \in M_2$ such that $f(v) = f(w)$; but $\nexists f \in M_2 \Rightarrow \nexists f \in M_1$.

Given that the symmetry relation $\Gamma_1 \leq \Gamma_2$ and $\Gamma_2 \leq \Gamma_1$ is only well-defined if the two graphs are homomorphic to each other, let P be the set of all transformation monoids on a fixed set of points. Allow P to be endowed with preorders $\subseteq$ and $\leq$, such that $M_1 \subseteq M_2 \Rightarrow \mathrm{Gr}(M_2) \leq \mathrm{Gr}(M_1)$, and $\mathrm{Gr}(M_2) \leq$

$\mathrm{Gr}(M_1)$ if $\mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$ is a spanning subgraph of $\mathrm{Gr}(M_1)$. Then $M_1 \subseteq M_2 \Rightarrow \mathrm{Gr}(M_1) \subseteq \mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$. So $\mathrm{Gr}(M_1) = \mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$. However this does not imply $M_1 = M_2$; if for example M_1, M_2 are both permutation groups then $\mathrm{Gr}(M_1) = \mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$ are both null graphs.

Next let $\mathrm{Gr}(M_1) \subseteq \mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$ if $\mathrm{Gr}(M_1)$ is contained as a spanning subgraph of $\mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}(M_1) \leq \mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$ if $\mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M_1)) \subseteq \mathrm{End}(\mathrm{Gr}(M_2))$. In the case that $\mathrm{Gr}(M_1)$ is a 3-path and $\mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$ is a 4-cycle, both $\mathrm{Gr}(M_1) \subseteq \mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}(M_1) \leq \mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$ are true.

Can we generalise the construction mentioned at the beginning so as to ensure that the equality $\mathrm{Gr}(M_1) = \mathrm{Gr}(M_2)$ derived above is sufficient to get a Galois correspondence or the pair $({}^{\triangleright}, {}^{\triangleleft})$ sets up a Galois connection?

In the context of this question, we mention the Galois correspondence found by Sauer and Stone [**472**] between semigroups of maps and (universal) algebras: a semigroup of endomorphisms is associated to each algebra over a set; to each semigroup of functions associate the algebra of finitary operations admitting the maps as homomorphisms.

(33) *Connections with Other Fields: K-Theory.* Encouraged by the set, number and probability-theoretic constructions of $\mathfrak{R}$ in [**103**], we attempt to find other examples in mathematics. Whenever a universal property arises, there is a chance to find a random edge-creating condition that gives $\mathfrak{R}$.

Let $n \geqq 0$ be an integer, S_n be the category of free abelian groups E_n of rank n ($\cong \mathbb{Z}^n$), together with a symmetric bilinear form $E_n \times E_n \to \mathbb{Z} : (x, y) \mapsto x \cdot y$, such that $E_n \cong Hom(E_n, \mathbb{Z})$. Write $E_n \cong E_n'$ for two isomorphic objects in S_n, and let $S = \bigcup_{n=0} S_n$, $0 \leq n \leq \infty$. We say that $E, E' \in S$ are *stably isomorphic* if there exists $F \in S$ such that $E \oplus F \cong E' \oplus F$. This is an equivalence relation, defining an additive composition law on $K_+(S) = S/\oplus$ [**485**].

The Grothendieck group $K(S)$ of S with respect to $\oplus$ follows from the semi-group $K_+(S)$, as $\mathbb{Z}$ does from $\mathbb{Z}^+$. The universal property of $K(S)$ arises because every product homomorphism $f_s \cdot f$, where $f_s : S \to K(S)$ and $f : K(S) \to A$ is an additive function on S, and A is a commutative group.

Define the Cayley graph on $K(S)$ by $\mathrm{Cay}(K(S), \mathcal{S}^- \cup \mathcal{S}^+)$, where $\mathcal{S}^{\pm} \subset K_{\pm}(S)$. One possible rule for edge-formation is to choose at random a finite subset $D = \{d_1, \ldots, d_k\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ which are

to be the dimensions of the elements in $K(S)$. Then the $(*)$-condition to form an edge is for all $E, E' \in K(S)$, join E *to* E' if and only if there exists an $F \in \mathcal{S}^+$ such that $\dim(E) - \dim(E') = \dim(F)$.

It is possible that this construction may be developed to forge links between random graph theory and *K-Theory*.

(34) *Algebraic Theory of Switching Groups.* Inspection of the finite presentations of the symmetric and braid groups given below in Appendix D shows that there is a homomorphism $B_n \to \mathrm{Sym}(n) : b_i \mapsto s_i$. A large part of the finite-dimensional representation theory of the symmetric group, using the ideas of partitions and Young diagrams, generalizes to representations of B_n. For example, from the early work of Burau [**76**] the reducible representation of $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ mapping $s_i \mapsto I_{i-1} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus I_{n-i-1}$ lifts to a reducible representation of B_n over the ring of Laurent polynomials $\mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}]$ mapping $b_i \mapsto I_{i-1} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 1-t & t \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus I_{n-i-1}$. When $t = 1$, the B_n representation collapses to a $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ one.

With this as motivation, we offer some speculative questions, which we divide up into four topics.

Algebra Homomorphisms. The group algebra of $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ deforms to a Hecke algebra H_n, which is a quotient of the group algebra of the braid group B_n. This is part of a sequence of algebra homomorphisms:

$$\mathbb{C}B_n \to W_n \to H_n \to A_n \to R_n \to \mathrm{Sym}(n)$$

where W_n is the Birman-Wenzl algebra, A_n the Jones algebra and R_n is generated by Burau matrices arising from the $(n-1)$-dimensional representation $\rho_n : B_n \to M_n(\mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}])$ [**47**], and M_n are the class of $n \times n$ matrices . Each algebra supports a Markov trace (being a map $B_n \to M_n(\mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}])$ to a certain Laurent polynomial) and thereby yields a link-type invariant such as the Alexander, Jones or Kauffman polynomials. A priori it seems that linking braidings, which require no two strands to pass through one another, with switchings, which have no such geometrical picture is unworkable. However given the homomorphisms between direct products of braid groups and switching groups, is there a switching group algebra that

would fit into the above sequence? (We note that the homomorphism goes via a product of symmetric groups, making the braids, in all probability, irrelevant).

Switching Group Invariants. Most link invariants have been interpreted as Markov traces on the disjoint union $B_\infty = \bigsqcup_{k\geq 1} B_k$ of braid groups. A Markov trace is a ring-valued function $f : B_\infty \to R$, which is a class invariant in each B_k and satisfies $f(\beta) = f(\mu^\pm(\beta))\ \forall \beta \in B_\infty$, where $\mu^\pm : B_k \to B_{k+1} : \beta \mapsto \beta b_k^\pm$. For example the homomorphism $\theta : B_n \to \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ is defined by the sequence $1 \to P_n \to B_n \to \mathrm{Sym}(n) \to 1$ where in the *coloured braid group* P_n, group multiplication preserves a well-defined assignment of colours to each of the n strands. This yields as a Markov trace the set $f(\beta)$ = the number of cycles in $\theta(\beta)$, and so the link invariant is the number of components. Can such a Markov trace be produced for the switching group union $S_\infty = \bigsqcup_{n\geq 1} S_{m,n}$?

Braid Groups and Yang-Baxter Equation. There are a series of linear representations of braid groups $B_n \to \mathrm{End}(W^{\otimes n})$ associated to any finite-dimensional complex simple Lie algebra L and its finite-dimensional irreducible representations $\rho : \mathsf{L} \to \mathrm{End}(W)$. Letting $\{I_\mu\}$ be an orthonormal basis of L with respect to the Cartan-Killing form enables the definition $\Omega_{\alpha\beta} = \Sigma_\mu \rho_\alpha(I_\mu) \otimes \rho_\beta(I_\mu)$ where ρ_α is the non-trivial representation only on the α-th factor. Rational solutions of the classical Yang-Baxter equation lead to the *infinitesimal pure braid relations* [**334**, pp. 730, 768] [**335**, p. 78]:

$$[\Omega_{\alpha\beta}, \Omega_{\alpha\gamma} + \Omega_{\beta\gamma}] = [\Omega_{\alpha\beta} + \Omega_{\alpha\gamma}, \Omega_{\beta\gamma}] = 0 \text{ for } \alpha < \beta < \gamma$$
$$[\Omega_{\alpha\beta}, \Omega_{\gamma\delta}] = 0 \text{ for distinct } \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta.$$

As observed in Theorem 2.10, the commutator $[\sigma_{c,d,\{x\}}, \sigma_{d,e,\{y\}}]$ of two switchings permutes the ordered triple of colours (c, d, e) to (d, e, c). With this interpretation the switchings satisfy the above relations. Is there a genuine connection here?

Representations of Switching Groups. Motivated by V. Jones' Hecke algebra representation theory for the braid group [**316**], can we find a Hecke algebra representation theory for any of the switching groups? Given the structural resemblance of the switching and the hyperoctahedral groups, is there a geometrical interpretation for the switching groups that is somehow dual to that for the hyperoctahedral groups?

APPENDIX A

Prerequisite Background

In this appendix we establish some of the basic notation, and collect objects of study and theory on which the results of this monograph are built.

1. Permutation Groups

A *permutation group* G on a set Ω is a subgroup of the symmetric group $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ of all permutations of Ω. More generally, a *permutation representation* of G on Ω is a homomorphism $G \to \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$. Equivalently we can say that G *acts on* Ω, or *induces* a permutation group on Ω, or that Ω is a *G-space*. Most interesting properties of a group action are properties of its image; so the theories of group actions and permutation groups are almost identical. Two G-actions on sets Ω_1 and Ω_2 are isomorphic if there is a bijection between the two domains such that the permutations induced by any element of G correspond under the bijection. The *degree* of a permutation group is the cardinality of the set Ω.

Throughout this work we will assume the convention that groups act on the right.

If there exists $g \in G$ such that $xg = y$ then $x \sim y$ is an equivalence relation on Ω whose equivalence classes are called *orbits*, and G is *transitive* if it has one orbit. Every G-space can be uniquely expressed as a disjoint union of transitive G-spaces. Any transitive action of G is isomorphic to the action on the set of right cosets of a subgroup. The actions on the sets of right cosets of subgroups H and K are isomorphic if and only if the subgroups H and K are conjugate. Assume that $k \leq |\Omega|$. A group is *k-transitive* if it is transitive on the set of ordered k-subsets of Ω and it is *k-homogeneous* if it is transitive on the set of unordered k-subsets of Ω. A group is *highly transitive* (respectively *highly homogeneous*) if it is k-transitive (respectively k-homogeneous) for every positive integer k. If a group $G \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acting on a graph Γ is 2-transitive then the full automorphism group of the graph is the symmetric group on the vertex set, and the graph is either complete

or null. A theorem of Cameron [**78**] states that any highly homogeneous but not highly transitive permutation group is dense in the automorphism group of one of the following: (i) a dense linear order; the betweenness relation induced from a dense linear order; a dense circular order; the quaternary separation relation induced from a sense circular order.

The *setwise stabilizer* $G_{\{\Delta\}}$ of a subset $\Delta \in \Omega$ is the group whose elements are $\{g \in G : \Delta g = \Delta\}$. More generally the *pointwise stabilizer* $G_{(\Delta)}$ is the set of permutations that fix every point of Δ. In terms of subgroups, $G_{(\Delta)} \leq G_{\{\Delta\}} \leq G$. If $\Delta = \{x\}$, then its setwise and pointwise stabilizers coincide, and are denoted by G_x.

Let H be a subgroup of the abstract group G. The *coset space* of H in G is the set of right cosets of H in G, and G acts on it by $(Hx)g = Hxg$. If G acts transitively on Ω then Ω is isomorphic to the coset space of G_x in G for a point $x \in \Omega$. The permutation group G is *semiregular* if only the identity has a fixed point; thus it is freely acting. The centralizer of a transitive group is semiregular, and the centralizer of a semiregular group is transitive. If G is transitive and semiregular then G is said to be *regular*, or simply transitive or sharply 1-transitive. (A permutation is regular if all cycles in its canonical cycle decomposition have the same length). In this case, Ω is isomorphic to G, G acts on Ω by right multiplication, and this is called the *right regular representation*. Also in this case, G is isomorphic to its permutation group image and is said to act *faithfully* on Ω because the kernel is the identity. Cayley used this action to show that every group is isomorphic to a permutation group. The centralizer in the symmetric group of the image of the right regular representation is the left regular representation in which $g \in G$ induces the permutation $x \mapsto g^{-1}x$. The two representations commute with each other: $g^{-1}(xh) = (g^{-1}x)h$. The *diagonal group* $G^* = G \times G$ acts transitively on G as the product of the two regular actions, $g^{-1}xh$, with the left and right actions as normal subgroups, and the *diagonal subgroup* $\{(g, g) : g \in G\}$, acting by conjugation on G and stabilizing the identity.

The Orbit-Stabilizer Theorem says that if the finite group G acts transitively on a set Ω, and $x \in \Omega$, then $|G_x| = |G|/|\Omega|$.

Let $\mathrm{fix}(g)$ be the number of points of Ω fixed by $g \in G$. We shall have cause to use the following theorem,

A.1. Theorem (Orbit-Counting Lemma). *Let G be a permutation group on the finite set Ω. Then the number of orbits of G on Ω is equal*

to the average number of fixed points of an element of G, that is,

$$\frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}\mathrm{fix}(g).$$

Recall some theory [**107**] of groups with regular normal subgroups. If N is any group, and H a subgroup of its automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(N)$, then the semidirect product of N by H acts as a permutation group on N, with N as regular normal subgroup and H as the stabilizer of the identity: the element hn of $N \rtimes H$ acts on N as $x^h n$ for $x, n \in N, h \in H$. Conversely, if G is any permutation group on a set Ω with a regular normal subgroup N, then there is a bijection from Ω to N, which takes the given action of N on Ω to its action on itself by right multiplication, and the given action of the subgroup $H = G_1$, the stabilizer of 1 to its action by conjugation. The action of the point stabilizer on Ω is isomorphic to its action on N by conjugation. The group $N \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}(N)$ is called the *holomorph* of N, denoted $HOL(N)$, and $G \leq HOL(N)$. The holomorph of N is the normalizer of its right regular representation in $\mathrm{Sym}(N)$.

Suppose that G is transitive on Ω. A *congruence* is a G-invariant equivalence relation on Ω, or thought of as a set of ordered pairs is a union of orbits of G in its action on $\Omega \times \Omega$. A group is *primitive* if its only congruences are the trivial ones of equality and the universal relation with one equivalence class. Otherwise the group is said to be *imprimitive*. Finite primitive groups are small, and they are rare. Examples of infinite primitive groups are the automorphism group of the random graph and of the Henson graphs (see Chapters 2 and 11). If G is transitive but imprimitive, and E is a non-trivial G-congruence on Ω then the set of E-classes is called a *system of imprimitivity* and its elements are called *blocks of imprimitivity*.

A subgroup $H < G$ is *maximal* in G if $\forall x \in G \backslash H$, $G := \langle H, x\rangle$. A transitive group G is primitive if and only if G_x is a maximal subgroup of G. More generally, the congruences form a lattice isomorphic to the lattice of subgroups lying between G_x and G. Finite transitive groups can be built from primitive groups, which are classified by the O'Nan–Scott Theorem [**360**] [**477**]. An analogous result is true for some but not all infinite permutation groups; it is true for example for oligomorphic groups because they only have finitely many congruences. Examples of maximal subgroups of the automorphism group of the random graph include stabilizers of finite sets of vertices, unordered edges and unordered non-edges. Some properties of primitivity are given in

A.2. Theorem. (a) *A 2-transitive group is primitive.*
(b) *A non-trivial normal subgroup of a primitive group is transitive.*

The *socle* $\mathrm{soc}(G)$ of a finite group G is the product of its minimal normal subgroups. It is itself normal in G and is a direct product of finite simple groups. If G is primitive then either $\mathrm{soc}(G)$ is a product of isomorphic finite simple groups in a known permutation action, or $N = \mathrm{soc}(G)$ is simple and $G \le \mathrm{Aut}(N)$.

A group A is a *B-group* if any primitive permutation group G which contains A acting regularly is 2-transitive; that is, if any overgroup of A which kills all the A-invariant equivalence relations necessarily kills all the non-trivial A-invariant binary relations. The letter B stands for Burnside, who showed that a cyclic group of prime-power but not prime order is a B-group. The proof contained a gap which was subsequently fixed by Schur, who invented and developed Schur rings for this purpose. The theory of Schur rings (or S-rings) is connected with many topics in representation theory, quasigroups, association schemes, and other areas of mathematics; historically, it was an important source of ideas in these subjects. The theory of S-rings and its connection with representation theory is described in Wielandt's book [**551**].

Primitive groups are comparatively rare. For example, the set of numbers for which there exists a primitive group of degree n other than $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ and $\mathrm{Alt}(n)$ has density zero [**122**], and so the set of orders of non B-groups has density zero. The precise result [**122**] of Cameron, Neumann, Teague is that if $N(x)$ is the number of $n \le x$ where $\exists H < G \ne \mathrm{Alt}(n), \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ with H regular and G primitive, then $\frac{N(x)}{x} \to 1$ as $x \to \infty$.

There are no known infinite B-groups. A *square-root set* in a group X is a set of the form

$$\sqrt{a} = \{x \in X : x^2 = a\}.$$

If $a \ne 1$, it is called *non-principal*. One of the most powerful nonexistence theorems is the following result [**116**],

A.3. Theorem. *Let A be a countable group with the following property:*

A cannot be written as the union of finitely many translates of non-principal square-root sets together with a finite set.

Then A is not a B-group. More precisely, there exists a primitive but not 2-transitive group G which contains a regular subgroup isomorphic to each countable group satisfying this condition.

The group G in Theorem A.3 includes the automorphism group of the (2-coloured) random graph. The condition of this theorem is not very restrictive: any countable abelian group of infinite exponent satisfies the condition; and for any finite or countable group A, the direct product of A with an infinite cyclic group satisfies it, so G embeds every countable group as a semiregular subgroup. Automorphism groups of multicoloured random graphs (see section below) are primitive but not 2-transitive. So if a group embeds as a regular subgroup of such an automorphism group then it cannot be a B-group.

The *normal core* of a subgroup H of a group G is the largest normal subgroup of G that is contained in H, or equivalently it is the intersection of the conjugates of H. More generally, the core of H with respect to a subset $S \subseteq G$ is

$$\mathrm{Core}_S(H) := \bigcap_{s \in S} s^{-1} H s.$$

So the normal core is the core with respect to $S = G$. The normal core of a pointwise stabilizer acts as the identity on its entire orbit, and in a transitive action is precisely the kernel of the action.

A *core-free* subgroup is one whose normal core is the trivial subgroup, or equivalently, one that occurs as the stabilizer subgroup of a transitive, faithful group action.

We next consider a concept that is weaker than primitivity, giving some of the interesting operand graphs; the groups and graphs are intended to be finite. There are natural connections between *quasiprimitive* permutation groups, all of whose non-trivial normal subgroups are transitive, [**447**] [**448**] and arc-transitive, Cayley and bipartite graphs. A partition π of a set Ω with $G \leq \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ being transitive, is called *G-invariant* if for all $g \in G$ and $p \in \pi$, we have that $p^g = \{x \in p\}$ again belongs to π. To strengthen this, call a partition *G-normal* if there exists $K \lhd G$ such that π is the set of K-orbits in Ω. A primitive permutation group has only trivial G-invariant partitions (singleton subsets and the universal partition $\{\Omega\}$), but G is quasiprimitive if and only if the only G-normal partitions are the trivial ones. If π has *maximal blocks*, that is, if the only G-invariant partitions with π as refinement are the universal partition $\{\Omega\}$ and π itself, then G induces a primitive permutation group $G^\pi \cong G$ on π. An overgroup of a quasiprimitive group need not be quasiprimitive, unlike the equivalent property for primitive groups; if G is imprimitive quasiprimitive and π a non-trivial G-invariant partition then the stabilizer of π in $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ has $\prod_{p \in \pi} \mathrm{Sym}(p)$ as a non-trivial intransitive normal subgroup.

An *s-arc* in a graph Γ is an $(s+1)$-tuple $(v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_s)$ of vertices in Γ such that $v_i \sim v_{i-1}$ $(1 \le i \le s)$ and $v_{j-1} \ne v_{j+1}$ $(1 \le j \le s-1)$. Given $G \le \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ we call Γ *locally* (G,s)*-arc transitive* if Γ contains an s-arc and given any two s-arcs α, β starting at the same vertex v, there exists an element $g \in G_v : \alpha \to \beta$. Call Γ *locally s-arc transitive* if it is locally (G,s)-arc transitive for some $G \le \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$. A graph is *G-locally primitive* if the stabilizer G_v of every vertex v acts primitively on the set $\Gamma(v)$ of neighbours of v, and *locally primitive* if it is G-locally primitive for some automorphism group G. If Γ has valency at least two then it is locally $(G,2)$-arc transitive if and only if for every vertex v, G_v acts 2-transitively on the set $\Gamma(v)$. So locally $(G,2)$-arc transitive graphs are G-locally primitive. Finite graphs of vertex valency at least two, admitting vertex-intransitive automorphism groups G are either locally (G,s)-arc transitive for $s \ge 2$ or G-locally primitive, are bipartite with the two parts of the bipartition being the orbits of G, and G being edge-transitive [**239**]. Much of the research on locally (G,s)-arc transitive graphs has centered on the possible point stabilizers of two adjacent vertices.

If π is a partition of Ω, the *quotient graph* of graph $\Gamma = (\Omega, E)$ relative to π is defined to be the graph $\Gamma_\pi = (\pi, E_\pi)$ where $\{\pi, \pi'\} \in E_\pi$ if and only if there exists $p \in \pi, p' \in \pi'$ such that $\{p, p'\} \in E$. If π is invariant under $G \le \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$, then $G^\pi \le \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_\pi)$. If $N \lhd G = \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ which is intransitive on both parts of a bipartite graph, then taking quotients with respect to the orbits of N preserves both local primitivity and local s-arc-transitivity and leads to the study of graphs where G acts faithfully on both orbits and quasiprimitively on at least one [**239**]. If $N \lhd \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts intransitively on vertices, then the *quotient graph* of graph Γ_N has the N-orbits on $V(\Gamma)$ as the vertex set, and two N-orbits B_1, B_2 are adjacent in Γ_N if and only if $\exists v \in B_1, w \in B_2$ such that $v \sim w$ in Γ. A graph Γ is a *cover* of Γ_N if $|\Gamma(v) \cap B_2| = 1$ $\forall v \in B_1$ and edge $\{B_1, B_2\} \in \Gamma_N$. If Γ is a bipartite (G,s)-arc transitive graph, and $|G : G^+| = 2$ where G^+ fixes both parts of the bipartition then Γ is locally (G^+, s)-arc transitive. If Γ is a nonbipartite (G,s)-arc transitive graph, then Γ is a cover of Γ_N and Γ_N is a $(G/N, s)$-arc transitive graph. So the problem becomes one of finding all examples where G acts quasiprimitively on vertices and finding their covers.

Finally we distill a construction, useful in the study of quasiprimitive groups, of an edge-transitive graph from a given group G and pair of subgroups L, R such that $L \cap R$ is core-free in G; a subgroup H of G is *core-free* if $\cap_{g \in G} H^g = 1$. Let Δ_1 be the set $[G : L]$ of right cosets of L in G, and Δ_2 be the set $[G : R]$ of right cosets of R in G. The bipartite *coset graph* $\mathrm{Cos}(G, L, R)$ has vertex set the disjoint union $\Delta_1 \sqcup \Delta_2$ such

that two vertices Lx and Ry are adjacent if and only if $xy^{-1} \in LR$. The group G acts on the vertex set of graph by right multiplication, G is edge-transitive, and L and R are the stabilizers of the adjacent vertices L, R respectively.

A.4. PROPOSITION. *Let* $\Gamma = \mathrm{Cos}(G, L, R)$ *for some group* G *with subgroups* L, R *such that* $L \cap R$ *is core-free, and* $\Delta_1 = [G : L]$ *and* $\Delta_2 = [G : R]$. *Then*

(1) Γ *is connected if and only if* $\langle L, R\rangle = G$;
(2) $G \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$, Γ *is* G*-edge-transitive, and* Δ_1 *and* Δ_2 *are* G*-orbits on vertices;*
(3) G *acts faithfully on* Δ_1 *and* Δ_2 *if and only if both* L *and* R *are core-free,*
(4) Γ *is locally* $(G, 2)$*-arc transitive if and only if* L *is* 2*-transitive on* $[L : L \cap R]$ *and* R *is* 2*-transitive on* $[R : L \cap R]$.

Conversely, if Γ *is a* G*-edge transitive but not* G*-vertex transitive graph, and* $v \sim w$ *then* $\Gamma \cong \mathrm{Cos}(G, G_v, G_w)$.

In spite of the fact that the groups $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ $(m \geq 2)$ are simple, we have found overgroups which may potentially be quasiprimitive. So our intention in giving the above concepts for the finite theory, has been to stimulate research on infinite quasiprimitive groups and their relations to infinite graphs.

We mention one other generalisationsof primitivity: a transitive permutation group G of finite degree is *semiprimitive* if it is not regular and if every normal subgroup of G is transitive or semiregular [**38**].

Let S be a subset of a group G. The *Cayley graph* $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ is the directed graph with vertex set G, having directed edges (g, sg) for all $g \in G$ and $s \in S$. If $1 \notin S$, then the graph has no loops; if $s \in S \Rightarrow s^{-1} \in S$, then it is an undirected graph (that is, whenever (g, h) is an edge, so is (h, g), and we can regard edges as unordered pairs). The graph $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ is connected if and only if S generates G. The regular action of G on the vertex set of $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ by right multiplication is an automorphism group of $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$. Conversely when a graph Γ admits an automorphism group G acting regularly on the vertices, then Γ is isomorphic to a Cayley graph for G. (Choose a point $\alpha \in \Omega$, and take S to be the set of elements s for which $(\alpha, \alpha s)$ is an edge).

A.5. THEOREM (Sabidussi's Theorem). [**469**] *A graph* Γ *is a Cayley graph of a group* G *if and only if there is a transitive and free action of* G *on* Γ.

Whilst not all vertex-transitive graphs are Cayley graphs, there is the following conjecture of McKay-Praeger

A.6. Conjecture. *If*

$$b_n := \frac{\sharp \ \textit{Cayley graphs on} \leq n \ \textit{vertices}}{\sharp \ \textit{Vertex-transitive graphs on} \leq n \ \textit{vertices}}$$

then $b_n \to 1$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

A *primitive Cayley graph* is a graph $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$, whose automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(Cay(G, S))$ is vertex-primitive. For example, if $S = G\backslash\{1\}$ then $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ is the complete graph K_n, where $n = |G|$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{Sym}(G) \cong Sym(n)$, and hence primitive.

Krön and Möller have studied [**341**] a generalization of Cayley graphs called *rough Cayley graphs* defined for compactly generated totally disconnected locally compact topological groups. A connected graph Γ is a rough Cayley graph of a topological group G if G acts transitively on Γ and the vertex-stabilizers $U = G_x$ are compact open subgroups of G. The vertex set is G/U and two distinct left cosets xU and yU are adjacent if there are elements $g \in xU$ and $h \in yU$ such that g and h are adjacent in G/U. The G-action on G/U induces an action of G on Γ. Conversely if $S = U \cup \{g_i(x) | i \in I\}$ where $U = G_x$ and $\{g_i(x) | i \in I\}$ are the neighbours of x for $\{g_i(x)\} \in G$ generates an ordinary Cayley graph Γ, then the quotient graph (defined below) of Γ with respect to U gives a rough Cayley graph. When a group is finitely generated, various of its properties are independent of the choice of finite generating set used to construct the Cayley graph; analogously a rough Cayley graph, generated by the union of a compact open subgroup and a finite set, is a quasi-isometric invariant of the group. Compact open subgroups are commensurable with each other and with their conjugates.

Let H and K be permutation groups acting respectively on sets Σ and Δ. Take $\Omega = \Sigma \times \Delta$ where fibres bijective with Σ form a covering space of Δ, as in Figure 1; this affords the so-called *imprimitive action* of the wreath product. The *base group* B is the cartesian product of $|\Delta|$ copies of H, that is one for each fibre of Ω (or each element of Δ). The *top group* K_1 is the permutation group on Ω obtained by letting K permute the fibres according to its given action on Δ. The *wreath product* $H \operatorname{Wr} K$ is the semi-direct product of B and K_1.

Let G be transitive but imprimitive on Ω, Σ be a congruence class, H the permutation group induced on Σ by its setwise stabilizer in G, Δ the set of congruence classes, and K the group induced on Δ by G.



FIGURE 1. Fibre diagram for defining wreath product

Then G can be embedded in a natural way as a permutation group into $H \operatorname{Wr} K$.

The above *full wreath product* is to be distinguished from the *restricted wreath product* denoted $H \operatorname{wr} K$, in which B is a restricted cartesian power of H by Δ, that is the set of functions $\Delta \to H$ has value 1 at all but a finite number of arguments.

If the congruences are partially ordered then a more general wreath product can be defined [**90**].

In the *product action* of $H \operatorname{Wr} K$ on the set of functions $\phi : \Delta \to \Sigma$, that is on the set of global sections (or transversals) of the fibre bundle, an element f of the base group acts by $\phi \cdot f(i) = \phi(i) \cdot f(i)$, and the top group acts on the arguments of the functions by $\phi \cdot k(i) = \phi(ik^{-1})$. If $|\Sigma|, |\Delta| > 1$ then $H \operatorname{Wr} K$ in its product action is primitive if and only if H is primitive but not regular on Σ, Δ is finite, and K is transitive on Δ. (The only primitive regular finite groups are the cyclic groups C_p of prime order p).

The *finitary symmetric group* $\operatorname{FSym}(\Omega)$ is the group of permutations of an infinite set Ω that move only finitely many points. Because such permutations move only finitely many points, they can be assigned a parity, regardless of the number of fixed points. This allows us to define the *alternating group* $\operatorname{Alt}(\Omega)$ of all even permutations.

The Jordan–Wielandt Theorem states that the only primitive finitary groups on an infinite set Ω are $\operatorname{FSym}(\Omega)$ and $\operatorname{Alt}(\Omega)$. We also mention Neumann's extension to a structure theory for transitive finitary groups.

The Theorem of Baer, Schreier and Ulam [**19**] [**474**], states that (using the axiom of choice, a statement of which is given in a later section) for a set Ω, not necessarily countable, the proper normal subgroups of

$\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ are (i) the trivial group; (ii) $\mathrm{Alt}(\Omega)$; (iii) the bounded symmetric group $\mathrm{BSym}_\alpha(\Omega)$ consisting of all permutations moving fewer than α points, for each infinite cardinal $\alpha \le |\Omega|$; (iv) $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$. In the case of a countable set Ω the factor groups are those in the normal series

$$1 \trianglelefteq \mathrm{Alt}(\Omega) \trianglelefteq \mathrm{FSym}(\Omega) \trianglelefteq \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$$

of simple groups. A proof of the classification can be found in [**478**].

An *oligomorphic* permutation group is one having finitely many orbits in its induced action on n-tuples for all n. This concept has been central in uncovering connections between permutation groups and model theory. A *cofinitary* permutation is one that fixes only finitely many points. A *cofinitary permutation group* is one in which every non-identity element is cofinitary. Primitive cofinitary groups are too wild to enable a classification.

A graph is *locally finite* if all vertex valencies are finite, and *vertex-symmetric* if its automorphism group is transitive on vertices. Whilst the random graphs of this monograph are far from being locally finite, there is a connection with other objects that are of interest. The group of *bounded automorphisms* (for which $d_\Gamma(v, gv) \le c$, for some $c \in \mathbb{N}$), is a normal subgroup of the overlying automorphism group. For example, for $\mathbb{Z}^2$ the bounded automorphisms are the translations $(x, y) \mapsto (x + a_1, y + a_2)$. A *system of imprimitivity* σ for a group $G \le \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acting on $V(\Gamma)$ is a partition of $V(\Gamma)$ into blocks that are permuted by each automorphism; the automorphism group of Γ/σ induced by G is denoted G^σ. The work of Trofimov on group actions on locally finite graphs, summarized in [**525**], includes the following results,

A.7. Theorem. *Let Γ be a connected locally finite vertex-symmetric graph. An automorphism g of Γ is bounded if and only if there exists a system of imprimitivity σ of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on $V(\Gamma)$ with finite blocks such that $\langle g^{\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)}\rangle^\sigma$ is a finitely generated abelian group with finite index $|\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma/\sigma) : C_{\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma/\sigma)}(\langle g^{\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)}\rangle^\sigma)|$.*

A.8. Theorem. *The automorphism group of the previous theorem is bounded if and only if there is a system of imprimitivity of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on $V(\Gamma)$ with finite blocks such that Γ/σ is a Cayley graph of the abelian group G^σ acting on it in the natural way if and only if G^σ is a finitely generated free abelian group.*

A *lattice* is precisely a connected locally finite graph with a vertex-transitive group of bounded automorphisms.

The class of all connected vertex-transitive graphs forms a locally compact, complete and totally disconnected metric space. Giudici, Li, Praeger, Seress and Trofimov studied [**241**] the structure of graphs which are limit points of convergent sequences in this space of the subset of all finite graphs admitting a vertex-primitive automorphism group. These *limit graphs* differ from Fraïssé limits [**220**] and from the theory of graphs as homogeneous structures [**292**]. There is also a dependent concept of a limit of a sequence of automorphisms, called a *limit automorphism*. A certain class of limiting graphs was shown to be Cayley graphs of a finite-rank free abelian group. The Leech lattice can be realised as a limit graph, with the double cover of Co_1 as accompanying lattice reflection group, in the sense of [**241**], as can any root lattice of a crystallographic finite reflection group.

A different study of so-called *graph limits* is mentioned in section 5 of this Appendix.

A permutation group (G, Ω) is *2-closed* if any permutation of Ω which fixes every G-orbit on pairs belongs to G, or alternatively if and only if there is a complete edge-coloured digraph Γ with vertex set Ω for which $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma) = (G, \Omega)$. The notion of k-closure is defined similarly: a group G is k-closed if every permutation which fixes all G-orbits on k-sets belongs to G. The group G is *closed* in the natural topology on $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ if and only if G is k-closed for all $k \geq 2$.

There are many topics relating to infinite permutation groups that have an extensive literature, but are not utilised in this monograph, so we have omitted addressing them. These include: Jordan groups [**325**], and local and asymptotic behaviour of integer sequences enumerating orbits including studies of their growth rates and cycle index theory [**103**]. There are others that have a confluence with topology, and we mention a select few of these in a later section.

We end with an influential result proved in [**376**]: if Ω is an infinite set then $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ is not the union of a chain of $|\Omega|$ or fewer proper subgroups. An extension of the proof of this result gives the following one [**40**]: if S is a generating set for $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ then there exists a positive integer n such that every element of S can be written as a group word of length at most n in the elements of S.

Thorough treatments of permutation groups can be found in [**44**] [**107**] and [**177**]. The book [**393**] is devoted to a study of wreath products and its generalizations. More on oligomorphic permutations groups can be found in [**90**], and on cofinitary permutation groups

in [**98**]. Different aspects of the concept of closure of permutation groups are studied in [**358**], [**446**] and [**211**].

Finally in this section, we mention the *HNN-construction* [**280**] of an infinite group all of whose non-identity elements are conjugate, thus creating an infinite simple group. The diagonal group G^* stabilizes the identity, is transitive on the non-identity elements, so G is 2-transitive.

If $A, B \leq G$ and $\phi : A \to B$ is an isomorphism then for $G' = \langle G, t : t^{-1}at = a\phi \text{ for all } a \in A\rangle$

- G is embedded isomorphically in G';
- any finite-order element of G' lies in a conjugate of G (so that, if G is torsion-free then so is G');
- $t^{-1}Gt \cap G = B$ and $tGt^{-1} \cap G = A$.

The group G is called the *base* of G^*, t is called the *stable letter*, A, B the *associated subgroups*, and G^* the *HNN-extension* of G relative to A, B and ϕ.

If $1 \neq a, b \in G$ and G is torsion-free, then a is conjugate to b in G' and G' is torsion-free. Repeating this for each pair of non-identity elements of G, and putting $G_0 = G$ and $G_{n+1} = G_n^\dagger$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $G^* = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} G_n$ is countable, and any two non-identity elements of G^* lie in G_n for some n, so are conjugate in G_{n+1}.

Good discussions of this technique can be found in the book of Don Collins et al [**151**] and in [**369**].

2. Model Theory

Model theory is the study of the relationship between the logical properties of sets of formulas and the mathematical properties of structures satisfying these formulas.

Our focus is on *first-order logic*. The concept of *first-order property* comes from logic. Briefly, first-order *languages* include logical connectives $(\neg, \Rightarrow, \vee, \wedge)$, equality symbol $(=)$, quantifiers $(\forall, \exists)$, punctuation marks (parentheses, comma), countably many variables, symbols for functions, relations and constants.

First-order means that the quantification is only over elements of the structure, whereas second order logic allows quantification over subsets and relations. Tarski proposed that models of all infinite cardinalities be allowed within first-order logic and this became the accepted view.

For example, to say that a graph is connected is not a first-order sentence, because a path connecting two vertices may be finite but arbitrarily long; providing a bound by specifying that the longest path

has length n makes it first-order. A finite graph cannot satisfy the $(*)$-condition, but the statements of this condition are first-order. Every vertex of the countable random graph must have degree $\aleph_0$, because a degree-n vertex cannot be a property of almost all graphs.

We refer to [**32**] [**285**] for a detailed explanation of the term.

A *term* is a variable, a constant symbol, or an n-ary function symbol of the form $F(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ where the t_i are terms. An *atomic formula* is an n-ary relation symbol of the form $R(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, and a *formula* is either an atomic formula or of the form $(\phi \vee \psi)$, $(\phi \wedge \psi)$, $(\neg\phi)$, $(\phi \Rightarrow \psi)$, $(\phi \Leftrightarrow \psi)$, $(\forall x)\phi$, or $(\exists x)\phi$, where ϕ and ψ are formulas and x is a variable.

A variable x is *bound* in a formula ϕ if it occurs in a subformula $(\forall x)\psi$ or $(\exists x)\psi$, and any other occurences are called *free*. A *sentence* is a formula with no free variables.

First-order logic allows the combination of finitely many formulas with connectives, and the quantification over variables which range over the underlying set. The first-order language of graph theory consists of formulas, which are finite strings of the above symbols together with the adjacency symbol $(\sim)$, built inductively. Sentences in first-order logic must be finite in length and disallow quantification over sets or relations. So certain common properties, such as connectivity (which without a set quantifier fails the first of these conditions because it requires an infinite disjunction of sentences, one for each positive integer diameter), and 2-colourability (which requires a colouring function), are not first-order expressible.

A graph is *simple* if it has only one type of edge or adjacency, and *loopless* if no vertex is attached to itself by an edge. The theory of simple loopless graphs is that of a structure with an irreflexive symmetric binary relation $\sim$ that satisfies the following sentences:

$$\forall x(\neg x \sim x)$$

$$\forall x \forall y((x \sim y \wedge y \sim x) \vee (\neg x \sim y \wedge \neg y \sim x)).$$

A *structure* M over a first-order language L is a set X on which are defined constants (elements of X), n-ary functions (maps $X^n \to X$) and n-ary relations (subsets of X^n). A *valuation* assigns values to the variables in X and truth values ('true' or 'false') to the formulas. The truth value assigned is independent of the values assigned to bound variables in the formula, so a sentence is either true or false in M independent of the valuation. If the sentence σ is true in M then M is said to 'satisfy' or 'model' σ, which is written $M \vDash \sigma$. If M is a set of such sentences the we write $M \vDash \Sigma$. A *theory* $\mathrm{Th}(M)$ of a structure M is the set of all first-order sentences which are true in M.

An *expansion* or *reduct* refer to the addition or removal of some new constants, functions or relations to a language or structure, but (in the case of structures) keeping the same domain. In contrast, are notions of *extension*, *substructure* or *submodel* where the language is retained but the domain is made smaller or larger. The relations and functions of the submodel are the restrictions of those of the model. In general mathematical objects can be represented as first-order structures in different ways but each one will give rise to different substructures.

Thus far we have dealt with syntax and semantics in logic but a third aspect is deduction or inference. The simplest deductive system specifies that particular formulas are *axioms* whilst certain formulas can be deduced from others using *rules of inference*, such as *modus ponens* where ψ is inferred from ϕ and $\phi \Rightarrow \psi$. In a deductive system a formula is a *theorem* if it is either an axiom or deduced from other theorems using rules of inference. Alternatively, a *proof* is a finite sequence of formulas each of which is either an axiom or is inferred from earlier formulas, and a *theorem* is the last line of the proof.

A sentence σ 'is a consequence of' a set of sentences T, written $T \vdash \sigma$ if there is a finite list of sentences each deducible from the previous one, ending with σ. A set of formulas is *consistent* if no contradiction can be deduced from it. If a theory has a model then it must be consistent. A formula is *logically valid* if it is true in all valuations in all structures over the relevant language. A deductive system is *sound* if every theorem is logically valid and *complete* if every logically valid formula is a theorem. So a theory is complete if either $T \vdash \sigma$ or $T \vdash \neg\sigma$ for every sentence of L. If all countable models of a consistent theory are isomorphic then the theory is complete. An important theorem on completeness is the following,

A.9. Theorem (Gödel–Henkin Completeness Theorem). *There is deductive system for first-order logic which is sound and complete.*

Moreover, this system has the following properties:

(a) *A sentence ϕ can be deduced from a set Σ of sentences if and only if every structure satisfying Σ also satisfies ϕ.*
(b) *A set Σ has a model if and only if it is consistent.*

This theorem leads to the next two central results of model theory.

A.10. Theorem (Compactness Theorem). *A set Σ of sentences has a model if and only if every finite subset has a model.*

A.11. Theorem (Downward Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem). *If a set of sentences in a countable language has a model, then it has a finite or countable model.*

A language or structure is *relational* if it contains no function or constant symbols. Relational structures have the important property that every subset carries a substructure, for example an *induced subgraph* (one obtained by deleting vertices). A structure is *homogeneous* if every isomorphism between finite substructures extends to an automorphism of the entire structure.

The interplay of model theory and permutation group theory has been very fruitful [**325**]. The standard way of treating a permutation group G acting on a set Ω as the automorphism group of a relational structure with domain Ω, is to utilize a relational language L which has for every positive integer k and each G-orbit of Ω^k, a unique k-ary relation symbol r, and interpret $r(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ to be true only if $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ lies in the orbit. In this case L is called the *canonical language* and the resulting structure M as the *canonical structure* for G. If Ω is infinite then it is possible that $G < \mathrm{Aut}(M)$. Moreover $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ is the *closure* of G, that is they have the same orbits on the set of finite ordered subsets of M, (see the section on topology below). For example assuming that G is not 2-homogeneous on Ω, it can be realized as an automorphism group of a graph on Ω which is neither null nor complete, where the orbit on unordered pairs can be taken to be the edge set; the group may not be the *full* automorphism group of the graph.

A *tuple* from the domain M_s of a structure M is an element of M_s^k for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, that is, a k-tuple for some k. The *type* $\mathrm{tp}_M(\bar{a})$ of a tuple $\bar{a} \in M_s^k$ is the set of all formulas $\phi(x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1})$ which are true in M when $a_0, \ldots, a_{k-1}$ are substituted for $x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1}$; this is in fact a *k-type*, that is one of length k. If $B \subset M_s$ then $\mathrm{tp}_M(\bar{a}/B)$ is the type $\bar{a}$ in the expanded structure $(M, b)_{b \in B}$. A *type over a theory* T is a set of formulas realizable as $\mathrm{tp}_M(\bar{a})$ for some $\bar{a} \in M \models T$, that is a maximal set of formulas consistent with T when $x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1}$ are treated as new constant symbols. This can also be called a *type over* $\varnothing$ because it has no additional parameters. A *type over a model* M is a type over $\mathrm{Th}(M, a)_{a \in M}$. The following definition is intended to capture the notion of a 'large' model, as being one in which many types are realized. A structure M is *λ-saturated* where λ is an infinite cardinal, if for every $A \subset M_s$ with $\mathrm{card}(A) < \lambda$, every type over $\mathrm{Th}(M, a)_{a \in M}$ is realized in M_s. A complete theory has, up to isomorphism, at most one saturated model in a given cardinality.

A finite structure can be described by a single sentence. The *Upward Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem* asserts that if a set of sentences has an infinite model, then it has models of arbitrarily large cardinality. This follows easily from the Compactness Theorem. Cardinality of a structure is not a first-order property, so first-order axioms can at best specify a structure with the same cardinality as M, as being isomorphic to M. When this holds and $|M| = \lambda$ we say that M is *λ-categorical*. This concept applies also to a theory (a set of sentences). A theory that is λ-categorical for all infinite λ is called *totally categorical*. Totally categorical theories are concerned with those infinite structures about which most can be said using first-order statements. Modulo choice of language there are only countably many totally categorical theories and this motivates a programme to classify them [**284**]. It is known that, as long as a theory has infinite models, it cannot have a unique model; there will be models of arbitrarily large cardinality. The best we can do is ask that the theory is α-categorical, where α is an infinite cardinal, meaning that there is a unique model of cardinality α up to isomorphism. By a theorem of Vaught, there are only two types of categoricity, countable and uncountable: the theorem of Vaught [**537**] states that if a theory in a countable language is λ-categorical for any uncountable cardinal λ, then it is μ-categorical for any uncountable cardinal μ. So there is a dichotomy in types of categoricity: countable and uncountable. Uncountable categoricity gives rise to a powerful structure theory, extending that for vector spaces over a fixed field or algebraically closed fields of fixed characteristic (where a single invariant, the rank, determines the model). According to Zil'ber's Trichotomy Theorem [**563**] the class of all uncountably categorical structures divides, with respect to their properties, into three types: (1) field-like, (2) module-like, and (3) of disintegrated (discrete) type. Countable categoricity is more akin to a symmetry condition. One of the classical results that connect model theory to permutation group theory, proved independently by Engeler [**197**] Ryll-Nardzewski [**468**] and Svenonius [**509**] is

A.12. Theorem (Engeler–Ryll-Nardzewski–Svenonius Theorem). *The countable first-order structure M is countably categorical if and only if* $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ *is oligomorphic. Moreover, if these conditions hold then two tuples lie in the same orbit of* $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ *if and only if they have the same type (that is, they satisfy the same n-variable first-order formulas).*

As we mentioned in the preface, this theorem implies that axiomatisability of a structure is equivalent to the existence of a very large

automorphism group, a situation reminiscent of Felix Kelin's Erlanger Programm [**331**].

A more substantial statement of this theorem, including a list of equivalences is given in [**285**]. The theorem indicates that the symmetry groups of $\aleph_0$-categorical structures are rich in structure. Each isomorphism type of n-element substructures contributes at most $n!$ orbits on $M^{(n)}$, leading to the following corollary,

A.13. Corollary. *Let M be a countable homogeneous relational structure having only a finite number of isomorphism types of n-element substructures for all n. Then M is $\aleph_0$-categorical. In particular, this holds if there are only finitely many relation symbols in the language of M.*

The multicoloured random graphs that are the subject of this work exemplify this result.

In general, primitivity of a permutation group is not first-order, but it is if there is a bound on the number of 2-types in Ω (that is orbits on pairs) [**325**, p.21]. From Higman's work [**279**] it follows that G is primitive if and only if each G-orbit on unordered pairs, thought of as the edge set of an undirected graph, is path-connected. If G is thought of as a first-order structure and has finitely many orbits on Ω^2, for example if we assume a graph of bounded diameter $\leq k$ (which is a first-order property), then the claim follows. Of course primitivity is not first-order if no such bound exists.

We mention a general question. Which permutation groups of countable degree are automorphism groups of relational structures over finite relational languages? Frucht [**227**] showed that every abstract group is the automorphism group of some simple undirected graph.

We end with two notions that will be used in the section on topology in permutation groups below, and which arise in the classification of countable totally categorical structures; let M and N be two such structures.

Totally categorical theories are determined purely by their countable models. A *definable k-ary relation* in a structure M is a set $\phi(M^k)$ where $\phi(x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1})$ is a formula on L meaning $\{\bar{a} : M \vDash \phi(\bar{a})\}$; if there are no parameters from M, we say that the structure is *$\varnothing$-definable*. The structures M and N are *bi-definable* if there is a bijection from $\mathrm{dom}(M)$ to $\mathrm{dom}(N)$ taking $\varnothing$-definable relations to $\varnothing$-definable relations; this induces an isomorphism of automorphism groups, $\mathrm{Aut}(M) \cong \mathrm{Aut}(N)$, as permutation groups.

A weaker notion than bi-definability is *bi-interpretability*. We refer to [**325**] for proper definition, but note the following:

A.14. THEOREM. *Let M and N be countable structures. Then*

(A1) $\mathrm{Aut}(M) \cong \mathrm{Aut}(N)$ *as topological groups if and only if M and N are (infinitarily) bi-interpretable.*

(A2) *If M and N are both $\aleph_0$-categorical then* $\mathrm{Aut}(M) \cong \mathrm{Aut}(N)$ *as topological groups if and only if they are finitarily bi-interpretable.*

The theorems of Fraïssé's (see later appendix) and Engeler–Ryll-Nardzewski–Svenonius are connected through the concept of quantifier elimination, so we say a little about this.

A substructure M of a structure N is *elementary* if the identity map on M is elementary; N is an *elementary extension* of M. A complete first-order theory T has *quantifier elimination (q.e.)* if, given any formula $\phi(\bar{x})$, there is a quantifier-free formula

$$(\forall \bar{x})(\phi(\bar{x}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{x}))$$

provable from T. By the Completeness Theorem, this is equivalent to saying that the displayed sentence holds in every model of T. A structure M has q.e. if its theory does. If a theory has q.e. then tuples have the same type if and only if they are isomorphic. For a countable and $\aleph_0$-categorical structure q.e. is equivalent to homogeneity [**90**, p.44]. The concept of *existential closure* (see Appendix 9) is a generalization of quantifier elimination – a substructure M of a structure N is *existentially closed (e.c.)* in N if, for every tuple $\bar{a} \in M$ and existential formula $\phi(\bar{x})$, $\phi(\bar{a})$ holds in M if and only if it holds in N. A first-order theory T has q.e. if and only if every model of T is e.c. in a homogeneous model of T.

Let $\mathbf{K}$ a class of L-structures for a first-order language L. A set Φ of formulas of L is an *elimination set* for $\mathbf{K}$ if the formulas are equivalent (Boolean combinations of each other) in every structure in $\mathbf{K}$.

One of the uses of *quantifier elimination* is that structures in $\mathbf{K}$ can be classified up to elementary equivalence by inspection of equivalent sentences in the elimination set. As a special case, if $\mathbf{K}$ is the class of all models of a first-order theory T and all sentences in Φ are either deducible from T or inconsistent with T, then all models of T are elementarily equivalent, and so T is a complete theory. Another use is in the description of elementary embeddings; if Φ is an elimination set for $\mathbf{K}$, then the elementary maps between structures in $\mathbf{K}$ are precisely

those *homomorphisms* which preserve ψ and $\neg\psi$ for every formula $\psi \in \Phi$.

A theory with q.e. is *model-complete*, that is where every embedding of one model of T into another is an elementary map, that is preserves all first-order sentences. (By a result of Abraham Robinson, it suffices that every embedding preserves existential formulas.) The converse is false, but T has q.e. if and only if it is model-complete and the class of substructures of all models of T has the amalgamation property.

The theory of a countable $\aleph_0$-categorical structure is model-complete if and only if it is equivalent to a class of $(\forall\exists)$-sentences. Further, this is true if the structure is also homogeneous.

The random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ has quantifier elimination, but it was shown in [**51**] that its reducts do not, though its reducts are model-complete. However, they also show that

A.15. THEOREM. *Every reduct of $\mathfrak{R}$ has quantifier elimination if it is expanded by all relations with an existential definition in the reduct.*

The Random Graph and Stability

Central to model theory is the classification of mathematical structures using logical formulas, that is, which logical sentences are true in the structures, as well as the ways of constructing models of given sentences.

For example, the first-order theory of the random graph is equivalent to the theory

$$T = \forall x\ \neg(x \sim x) \cup \forall xy(x \sim y \leftrightarrow y \sim x) \cup \{\phi_{a,b} : a, b < \omega\},$$

where $\phi_{a,b} = \forall x_1 \dots x_a y_1 \dots y_b(\bigwedge_{i<j} x_i \neq x_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i<j} y_i \neq y_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i,j} x_i \neq y_j \longrightarrow \exists z(\bigwedge_i (z \neq x_i \wedge z \sim x_i) \wedge \bigwedge_j (z \neq y_j \wedge \neg(z \sim y_j))))$.

Shelah introduced the idea of *stability* as an aid to counting the number of non-isomorphic models of a theory in a given cardinality, going on to classify all complete first-order theories [**488**]. A complete theory T in a first-order language L is *unstable* if there is a formula $\phi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ of L and a model M of T containing tuples of elements $\bar{a}_i$ $(i < \omega)$ such that

$$\text{for all } i, j < \omega, M \vDash \phi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j) \Leftrightarrow i < j.$$

T is *stable* if it is not unstable. The structure M is stable or unstable according to whether or not T is.

The definable sets of a structure are a function of the language used. Building on earlier ideas of Morley [**399**], Shelah used the complexity

of the definable sets to count the number of models. If a theory is not stable then heuristically, its models are too numerous to classify, while a stable theory has a chance of classification. For example, if the definable sets are nested in a complicated fashion, it is less likely that there will be isomorphisms between models.

A formula $\phi(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$ has the *strict order property* (SOP) (for a complete theory T) if in every model M of T, ϕ defines a partial order on the set of n-tuples with an infinite (or arbitrarily long finite) chain(s). The theory T has the SOP if some formula has the SOP for T.

A formula $\phi(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$ has the *independence property* (IP) (for a complete theory T) if in every model M of T there is, for each $n < \omega$, a family of tuples $\bar{b}_0, \ldots, \bar{b}_{n-1} \in M$ such that for every subset X of n there is a tuple $\bar{a} \in M$ for which $M \models \phi(\bar{a}, \bar{b}_i)$ if and only if $i \in X$. The theory T has the IP if some formula has the IP for T.

Shelah defined a theory T to be *unstable* if there is a formula interpreting either the IP or the SOP. The prototypical theory having SOP is the theory of dense linear orders without endpoints, $(\mathbb{Q}, <)$. The theory of the (uniform) random graph is unstable, having the IP but not the SOP.

More on model theory can be found in standard texts such as [**285**], or its shorter version [**286**]. A survey of the first-order theory of graphs appears in [**104**]. More on the model theory of groups and automorphism groups can be found in [**206**].

3. Category and Measure

Let (X, d) be a complete metric space. A subset of X is *dense* if its closure is X, that is if it meets every open set. A subset is *residual* or *comeagre* or *of second category* if it contains the intersection of countably many dense open sets. The complement of such a set is called *meagre* or *of the first category*.

The *Baire category theorem* [**23**] states that a residual set in a complete metric space is non-empty. (See also Osgood [**423**]).

A residual set is dense; in other words it has a non-empty intersection with every dense open set. Moreover, any countable collection of residual sets has non-empty (even residual) intersection. For this reason we regard residual sets as "large", containing "almost all" of the space. (For example Cantor took uncountable sets (such as the reals) to be large and to contain finite or countable subsets. But there are two families of uncountable small sets:

• the *null sets* with respect to Lebesgue measure (those sets which can be covered by a countable union of intervals with total length at most ϵ, for any $\epsilon > 0$);

• the *meagre sets* in the topology (see below), (those contained in a countable union of closed sets with empty interior).

Both classes include the countable set. Sierpiński showed that there is a permutation of the real numbers which maps null sets to meagre sets; Erdős showed that we can take this permutation to be an involution interchanging the two families. So, as families of sets, they are isomorphic [**424**].)

It follows that if we can show that the set of elements having property $\mathcal{P}$ is residual, then some element will have property $\mathcal{P}$.

Metric spaces relevant to our study typically arise as follows. A point in the space is determined by a countable sequence of choices. The larger the agreement between the initial segment of the choice sequences determining two points, the closer are the two points. If points x and y differ first in the n^{th} term say, any decreasing function can determine their distance apart, for example $d(x, y) = \frac{1}{2^n}$.

We can see how this applies to the set of paths in a tree. The nodes of the tree occur on 'levels' indexed by the first n natural numbers $0, \ldots, n-1$. Define a metric on this set by the rule that two paths which agree up to level n and diverge thereafter should have distance $\frac{1}{2^n}$. This choice of distance function gives a space whose diameter is 1, but as long as a decreasing function of n is used its precise form is not crucial. With this metric the set of paths forms a complete metric space.

Before defining measures we mention some spaces on which a they may be defined. A *field* $\mathcal{F}(X)$ on a space X is a nonempty collection of subsets of X such that

(i) if $O_1, O_2 \in \mathcal{F}(X)$ then $O_1 \cup O_2 \in \mathcal{F}(X)$;
(ii) if $O \in \mathcal{F}(X)$ then $X \backslash O \in \mathcal{F}(X)$.

If in addition,

(iii) whenever $O_i \in \mathcal{F}(X)$ $\forall i = 1, 2, \ldots$ we have $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} O_i \in \mathcal{F}(X)$,

then the collection $\mathcal{F}(X)$ is called a *σ-algebra*. The space of all subsets is the largest σ-algebra. Another is the set $\mathcal{F}'(X)$ of all sets that can be described by finite-length expressions in the space X together with any collection G of subsets of X, using unions and complements; we say that $\mathcal{F}'(X)$ is the *field generated* by G. The intersection $\mathcal{F}_G(X)$ of all σ-algebras on X containing G, that is *generated by* G, is the smallest σ-algebra on X containing $\mathcal{F}'(X)$. If G has a finite set of generators then $\mathcal{F}'(X) = \mathcal{F}_G(X)$.

A *topological space* (X,T) is a space X together with a topology $T = T(X)$. A *topology* T for X is a set of subsets of X such that

(i) $\varnothing, X \in T$,
(ii) if $\{O_i : i \in \mathcal{I}\} \subset T$ is any collection of members of T then $\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}} O_i \in T$,
(iii) if $\{O_n : n = 1,\dots,N\}$ is any finite set of members of T then $\bigcap_{n=1}^{N} O_n \in T$.

The sets of T are called *open* sets.

Let (X,T) be a topological space. Then the set $\mathcal{B}(X)$ of *Borel subsets* of X is the σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}_{T(X)}(X)$ generated by the open subsets $T(X)$ of X.

A (finite, positive) *measure* μ on a space X is a function $\mu : \mathcal{F}(X) \to [0,\infty)$, where $\mathcal{F}(X)$ is a field, and

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(O_n) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} O_n\right)$$

whenever $\{O_n \in \mathcal{F}(X) : n = 1,2,\dots\}$ is a sequence such that for all $n,m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \neq m$, $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} O_n \in \mathcal{F}(X)$ and $O_n \cap O_m = \varnothing$.

One interpretation of μ is as a probability law in which $\mu(E)$ measures the probability that a randomly chosen point $x \in X$ belongs to E. A *probability* (or *normalized*) measure on X is one for which $\mu(X) = 1$. The measure for a Borel σ-algebra is called a *Borel measure*. Denote the set of Borel measures on X by $\mathcal{M}(X)$. The *support* of a Borel measure μ on a metric space (X,d) is the set of points $x \in X$ such that $\mu(O_x) > 0$ whenever O_x is an open set that contains x. Sometimes a measure can be described by a *density function*, and it may even be permissible that this function be piecewise continuous with discontinuities appearing on certain sets.

The next theorem states that a measure on a field uniquely extends to one on the σ-algebra generated by the field, and that the measure on the σ-algebra can be evaluated using only its values on the field.

A.16. Theorem. *Let X be a space, $\mathcal{F}'(X)$ be a field on X and $\mathcal{F}(X)$ be the smallest σ-algebra on X that contains $\mathcal{F}'(X)$. Let $\mu' : \mathcal{F}'(X) \to [0,\infty)$ be a measure. Then there exists a unique measure $\mu : \mathcal{F}(X) \to [0,\infty)$ such that $\mu(B) = \mu'(B)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{F}'(X)$. Moreover for all $A \in \mathcal{F}(X)$,*

$$\mu(A) = \inf\left\{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_n) : A \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n, B_n \in \mathcal{F}'(X)\ \forall n = 1,2,\dots\right\}.$$

A *measureable set* is one to which a measure can be assigned, that is, a member of a field or σ-algebra. The next theorem states that a

continuous transformation of a Borel measure is also Borel, because Borel sets are generated by open sets and the inverse transformations of open sets, under continuous transformations, are open sets.

A.17. THEOREM. *Let $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ be a Borel measure and let $f : X \to X$ be a continuous function. Then there exists on X a unique Borel measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ such that*

$$\mu(B) = \nu(f^{-1}(B)) \ \forall B \in \mathcal{B}(X).$$

The measure μ is called the *transformation of the measure* ν by the function f, and denoted by $f(\nu)$ or $f \circ \nu$.

Let (X, d) be a metric space and let $f : X \to X$ be a continuous function. A measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ is said to be invariant under f if and only if

$$\mu(B) = \mu(f^{-1}(B)) \ \forall B \in \mathcal{B}(X).$$

Such a measure is called an *invariant measure* of the transformation f, and the condition can be written $f(\mu) = \mu$.

A.18. THEOREM. *If $f, g : X \to X$ are continuous functions and the measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ is invariant under f then the measure $g(\mu)$ is invariant under $g \circ f \circ g^{-1}$.*

The two notions of "largeness" that appear in topology and Baire category theory are different. For example consider zero-one sequences and define the *upper density* of a zero-one sequence to be $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{s(n)}{n}$ where $s(n)$ is the number of ones among the first n terms of s, and the *lower density* to be defined similarly as $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{s(n)}{n}$. According to the Law of Large Numbers, the set of sequences having density $\frac{1}{2}$ has measure 1. However in the metric defined above, the set of sequences with upper density 1 and lower density 0 is residual. The "large" sets, analogous to residual sets, are sets of measure 1. So, for example, any countable intersection of sets of measure 1 has measure 1, and any set of measure 1 has cardinality $2^{\aleph_0}$.

In probability theory, a σ-algebra is often referred to as a *σ-field*. A *probability space* is a triple $(X, \mathcal{F}(X), \mu)$, where X is a set, $\mathcal{F}(X)$ is a σ-field of subsets of X, μ a non-negative measure on X, and $\mu(X) = 1$. Then μ is determined by a function $X \to [0,1], y \to \mu(\{y\})$, $\mu(Y) = \sum_{y\in Y} \mu(\{y\}), Y \subset X$. A real-valued *random variable* is a measurable real-valued function on a probability space.

In a probability space (a measure space of total measure 1), sets of measure 1 are considered "large". They share the property with residual sets that the intersection of countably many such sets is again of measure 1, and hence non-empty. The complementary statement is

that the union of countably many null sets is a null set. Any non-empty open set has positive measure; so a set of measure 1 is dense.

The notions of small sets that we mentioned at the beginning of the section can be widely generalized.

In any measure space, in particular in any probability space, the null sets form a family of small sets in our earlier sense, and the property that the union of countably many null sets is null, is a simple consequence of Kolmogorov's axioms for probability.

On the other hand, in any metric space, the *interior* of a set A is the set of points having a neighbourhood contained in A; a set is *open* if it is equal to its interior; a set is *closed* if its complement is open; and a set is *meagre* if it is contained in a countable union of closed sets with empty interior. It is clear that a countable union of meagre sets is meagre and a re-statement of the Baire category theorem would be: a complete metric space is not meagre.

So the meagre sets in any complete metric space satisfy the requirements for a family of small sets. The "large" sets will then be the comeager ones. A set is *comeagre* if and only if it contains a countable intersection of open dense sets (where a set is *dense* if every neighbourhood of every point in the space meets it).

There is a specific example which can be used to give a characterization of $\mathfrak{R}$ and so is instructive to elucidate it. Let X be the set of all infinite sequences of zeros and ones. We define the appropriate structures on X as follows:

- as a probability space, we regard elements of X as recording infinitely many tosses of a fair coin;
- as a metric space, two sequences are close if they agree on a long initial segment (for example, if the first disagreement is in position n, we take the distance to be $\frac{1}{n}$).

The metric space is not only complete, but in fact, it satisfies a strengthening of the triangle inequality known as the hypermetric inequality:

$$d(x,z) \leq \max(\, d(x,y), d(y,z)).$$

A subset $A \subset X$ is *open* if and only if it is *finitely determined*, that is, every sequence in A has a finite prefix all of whose continuations belong to A; and a set A is *dense* if and only if it is *always reachable*, that is, every finite sequence has a continuation belonging to A. Thus, any countable intersection of sets which are finitely determined and always reachable is non-empty.

These two conditions are purely combinatorial, and the topology has been removed. The sequence space obeys the Baire category theorem.

For measure, we have in fact nothing new. Regarding an infinite binary sequence as the base 2 "decimal" expansion of a real number, we have a bijection between the sequence space X and the unit interval, apart from a null set (the rationals with 2-power denominators have two represerntations); the bijection transforms the coin-tossing measure to Lebesgue measure on the interval. However, the topology of the two metric spaces is quite different. We can't expect to make infinitely many cuts in the unit interval without changing its topology drastically.

A property which holds for a large set is regarded as being a "typical" or "generic" property of elements of X, that is, almost all elements of X have this property. Here is a case where measure and category give different views of what the typical element looks like:

• The Law of Large Numbers asserts that amost all binary sequences (in the sense of measure, that is, the complement of a null set) have limiting density 1/2.

• On the other hand, almost all sequences (in the sense of category) have the property that they do not have a density; indeed, the lim inf of the density of the prefixes is 0 and the lim sup is 1. (To prove this, show that, for any n, the set of sequences having a prefix of length at least n with density less than $\frac{1}{n}$ is obviously finitely determined, and is always reachable by simply appending enough zeros to the given finite sequence.)

But there are many cases where they agree. For example, call a sequence *universal* if it contains every finite sequence of zeros and ones as a consecutive subsequence. To see that universal sequences exist simply concatenate all finite sequences. The category argument to seeing that universality is a "large" property, so that almost every sequence (in either sense) is universal, runs as follows. There are only countably many finite sequences, so it suffices to show that the set of infinite sequences containing a given finite sequence s is finitely determined and always reachable. For the first, if s occurs in a given sequence, then just choose a prefix containing s. For the second, given any prefix, append s to it, and every continuation will contain s.

Here is another example. Take a countably infinite set, say the natural numbers, and write down all the 2-element subsets in a sequence. Then there is a natural bijective correspondence between graphs on this vertex set, and our sequence space X: the nth pair of vertices is joined by an edge if the nth term of the sequence is 1, and not joined it it is 0. In the probabilistic model, we are choosing a random graph,

by tossing a fair coin once for each pair of vertices to decide whether to put an edge or not. What do almost all graphs look like? Well its $\mathfrak{R}$, so that almost all graphs are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$.

Before turning to $\mathfrak{R}$, we give a generalisation of the binary sequence space.

Let T be a countable rooted tree. Its nodes come on levels indexed by the natural numbers (including zero). The root is the unique node on level 0; each node other than the root has a unique predecessor on the preceding level, and at least one but at most countably many successors on the following level. A branch of T is an infinite path, starting at the root and containing one node on each level. (So if a branch contains a node, it must contain its predecessor). Let $X(T)$ be the set of all branches of T.

If each node has two successors, we have the infinite binary tree; labelling them by 0 and 1, we have a bijection between the set of branches and the set of infinite binary sequences.

If the number of successors of any node is finite, then we may define a probability measure on X in a simple way. For any node v, the measure of the set of branches containing v is the reciprocal of the product of the numbers of successors of nodes on the path from the root to v. We then extend to all measurable sets in the standard way. More intuitively, we take a random walk where, arriving at a node, we then proceed to one of its successors, each being equally likely. There are other measures which could be used.

The category model is simpler, and does not require that each node has only finitely many successors. We define the distance between two branches to be $\frac{1}{n}$ if they first diverge at level n; this makes X a complete metric space, so the Baire category theorem applies. Just as in the sequence case, it is purely combinatorial.

A set A of branches is *open* if and only if it is *finitely determined*, that is, for any branch x in A, there is a node v on x such that all branches containing v lie in A. And A is *dense* if and only if it is *finitely determined*, that is, any node lies on a branch in A. So our large sets are again those which contain countable intersections of finitely determined, always reachable sets.

We shall return to the concepts of finitely determined and always reachable in the next section.

A measure on the random graph is a function from the countable set of definable vertex subsets to $[0, 1]$. The finitely additive probability measures on the definable subsets of the random graph which are invariant under the graph automorphism group have been shown

to be integrals of Bernoulli measures arising from the coin-flipping model of random graph construction [**6**]. (Furthermore a random system can be formed from, the Bernoulli (left) shift map T, on the space $X = \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}} \equiv 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of infinite 0-1 sequences (or equivalently, the space of all sets of integers), together with uniform product probability measure, where $T(x_n)_{n\epsilon\mathbb{Z}} := (x_{n+1})_{n\epsilon\mathbb{Z}}$ is invertible and both it and its inverse are measurable. The Bernoulli shift is an example of a *strongly mixing system* which for measurable sets E and F for which $\mu(T^nE \cap F) \to \mu(E)\mu(F)$ as $n \to \infty$, that is the shifted sets become asymptotically independent of the unshifted sets [**513**].) This was extended to structures which do not have the independence property in [**199**]. An alternative random graph measure is studied in [**90**, p. 112], where it is used to indicate the probability that a sequence in the random graph is isomorphic to a given finite subgraph. The two types of measure are contrasted in [**6**] together with a study of other graph measures, such as those on triangle-free graphs.

Petrov and Vershik [**429**] study invariant measures on the set of universal countable graphs. The infinite symmetric group of a fixed countable vertex set V acts naturally on the set $\mathcal{G}$ of simple graphs. They equip the set $\mathcal{G}_V$ of all graphs with the *weak topology* whose base is formed by the collections of sets of graphs that have a given induced graph structure on a given finite vertex set. This permits consideration of Borel sets, σ-fields and probability measures on $\mathcal{G}_V$. They prove the existence of $\mathrm{Sym}(V)$-invariant probabilistic Borel ergodic (invariant) measures on the set of universal graphs and universal Henson graphs with the set of vertices $\mathbb{Q}$ and with shift invariant graph structure, and then extend the graph structure on the whole line $\mathbb{R}$. Taking $V = \mathbb{N}$, the space $\mathcal{G}_V$ supports $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{N})$, with orbits a class of isomorphic graphs and the stabilizer of a given graph, the automorphism group of the graph. This action extends to one on invariant Borel probability measures on the spaces of graphs and matrices, and is transitive on universal graphs. A 'random graph' in a given category is then a $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{N})$-invariant Borel probability measure on the set of graphs that is concentrated on the set of universal graphs of this category. The Erdős-Rényi random graphs are the Bernoulli measures on the space of adjacency matrices of Erdős-Rényi random graphs, with the distribution $(p, 1?p), 0 < p < 1$, for each entry. Our case of $p = \frac{1}{2}$ this Bernoulli measure is the weak limit of the uniform measures on the sets of finite graphs with n vertices as $n \to \infty$. There are uncountably many invariant ergodic measures on the set of K_n-free graphs for $n > 2$.

They define two new concepts, that of *measurable universal graphs* and *topological universal graphs*. Vertices of the latter lie in a Polish

space. They build a graph on the additive group $V = \mathbb{R}$, $E = \{(x, y) : |x - y| \in Z \subset (0, +\infty)\}$ and prove the following

A.19. THEOREM. *There is a universal topological graph (resp., universal topological triangle-free graph) with vertex set the additive group* $\mathbb{R}$ *and with graph structure which is invariant under the additive action of the group* $\mathbb{R}$ *on itself.*

In summary, the route they take is universal Borel graph with measures → topologically universal graph (→ homogeneous topologically universal graph for $\mathfrak{R}$ and K_3-free cases) → randomization in vertices → invariant measures on the set of countable universal graphs → randomization in edges → the list of all invariant measures on the set of countable universal (or K_n-free universal) graphs.

With an eye to future research we record some of Terence Tao's remarks on structure and randomness in ergodic theory and graph theory [**513**]. Tao notes the dichotomy between these two properties in

- Combinatorial number theory, (finding patterns in unstructured dense sets (or colourings) of integers);
- Ergodic theory and in particular multiple recurrence theory, (where a discrete dynamical system acts on probability spaces yielding patterns in positive-measure sets (or more specifically, measure-preserving actions of $\mathbb{Z}$) or probability preserving systems;
- Graph theory, (specifically finding patterns in large unstructured dense graphs); and
- Ergodic graph theory, (finding patterns within a measure-preserving action of the infinite permutation group, as one way in which to study infinite limits of graphs.

The first two on this list are discrete and finitary and connected by a Cayley graph construction, whilst the second two are continuous and infinitary. Tao writes

"On the other hand, we have some very rigorous connections between combinatorial number theory and ergodic theory, and also (more recently) between graph theory and ergodic graph theory, basically by the procedure of viewing the infinitary continuous setting as a limit of the finitary discrete setting. These two connections go by the names of the *Furstenberg correspondence principle* and the *graph correspondence principle* respectively. These principles allow one to tap the power of the infinitary world (for instance, the ability to take limits and perform completions or closures of objects) in order to establish results in the finitary world, or at least to take the intuition gained in the infinitary

world and transfer it to a finitary setting. Conversely, the finitary world provides an excellent model setting to refine one's understanding of infinitary objects, for instance by establishing quantitative analogues of 'soft' results obtained in an infinitary manner."

These comments, further discussed in [**513**], echo part of the philosophy behind our project.

As we often use the concept of Cayley graph in the main text, we mention two ways of putting metric spaces on them. For a finitely-generated group G with identity element e define $\forall g \in G$ the *length* $l_S(g) := \min(n)$ such that $g = s_1 s_2 \dots s_n$ where the s_i belong to a finite set S of generators. The Cayley graph $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ of G can be turned into a metric space by defining the distance function $d_S : G \times G \to \mathbb{R}^+$ where $d_S(g_1, g_2) = l_S(g_1^{-1} g_2)$.

Each edge of the Cayley graph can be turned into a metric space isomorphic to the unit interval $[0, 1]$ such that the left action of G gives isometries between edges. Thus $\mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ can be turned into an arc-connected metric space, and the inclusion $G \subset \mathrm{Cay}(G, S)$ is an isometry [**236**, p.300].

We end by noting that whilst there is a natural topology on the symmetric group, there is no natural measure.

A standard introduction to measure and category is [**424**].

4. Fraïssé's Theory of Relational Structures

Recall that a structure is *homogeneous* if every isomorphism between finite substructures extends to an automorphism of the entire structure. Also recall that the *theory* of a structure M, $\mathrm{Th}(M)$, is the set of all first-order sentences which are true in M. An $\aleph_0$-categorical relational structure M is homogeneous if and only if, modulo $\mathrm{Th}(M)$, every formula with parameters in M is equivalent to a quantifier-free formula [**285**]. Fraïssé produced a theory [**220**] that allows construction of a great variety of unique homogeneous structures. The multicoloured random graphs introduced in the next section are examples. The basic concept in Fraïssé's work is the *age* $\mathrm{Age}(M)$ of a relational structure M, which is the class of all finite structures (over the same logical language) which are embeddable in M as induced substructures.

The main result applicable to random graphs is

A.20. Theorem (Fraïssé's Theorem). *Let L be a purely relational first-order language. A class $Age(M)$ of finite L-structures is the age of a countable homogeneous relational structure M if and only if it satisfies the following properties:*

(A1) *Age*(M) *is closed under isomorphism,*
(A2) *Age*(M) *contains at most a countable number of non isomorphic structures,*
(A3) *Age*(M) *has the* Hereditary Property*, that is it is closed under taking induced substructures,*
(A4) *Age*(M) *has the* Joint Embedding Property*, that is, given* $A, B \in$ *Age*(M) *then there are a structure* $C \in$ *Age*(M) *and embeddings* $f_1 : A \to C$ *and embeddings* $g_1 : B \to C$*,*
(A5) *Age*(M) *has the* Amalgamation Property*, that is, given* $A, B_1, B_2 \in$ *Age*(M) *and embeddings* $f_i : A \to B_i$ *for* $i = 1, 2$*, there exists* $C \in$ *Age*(M) *and embeddings* $g_i : B_i \to C$ *for* $i = 1, 2$ *such that* $f_1 g_1 = f_2 g_2$*,*

then the structure M *is unique up to isomorphism.*

We refer to the amalgamation class of structures that satisfy this theorem as the *Fraïssé Class* (which we denote $\mathcal{A}$), and the homogeneous structure M guaranteed by this theorem as the *Fraïssé limit*.

If the language L is finite then there are only countably many isomorphism classes of finite L-structures. If Age(M) is defined by a set of universal L-sentences then Age(M) has the Hereditary Property. Much of the effort to prove a structure is homogeneous with the required age is consumed with verification of (A5).

Properties of relational structures such as their uniqueness and universality can be demonstrated using the back-and-forth method; in fact this is how Fraïssé's Theorem is proved. A related object, the homogeneous universal directed graph, is the Fraïssé limit for the class of all directed graphs; its existence can be proved by using the extension property, which implies both its universality and its homogeneity [**295**].

An important strengthening of the amalgamation property is the following,

(A5') Age(M) has the *Strong Amalgamation Property*, that is, given $A, B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ and embeddings $f_i : A \to B_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, there exists $C \in$ Age(M) and embeddings $g_i : B_i \to C$ for $i = 1, 2$ such that $f_1 g_1 = f_2 g_2$ and, if $b_1 \in B_1, b_2 \in B_2$ and $b_1 g_1 = b_2 g_2$, then there exists $a \in A$ such that $b_i = a f_i$ for $i = 1, 2$.

The difference between amalgamation and strong amalgamation is that the former allows the possibility that when B_1 and B_2 are glued over a common substructure A, some additional points also become identified, whereas the stronger version guarantees that amalgamation can be performed without such extra identifications. Therefore, the region labelled A'' in Figure 2 can be chosen to be empty. Equivalently,

in the Fraïssé Limit M, the automorphism group fixing any finite set of points has no further fixed points. There are structures that are homogeneous but for which strong amalgamation fails, such as "treelike objects". The strong amalgamation property is useful for producing constructions; one of its known properties [**88**] [**103**] is the following theorem:

A.21. THEOREM. *Let M be a countable homogeneous structure. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *The age $Age(M)$ has the strong amalgamation property;*
(b) *the stabilizer in $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ of any finite number of points has no additional fixed points;*
(c) *the stabilizer in $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ of any finite number of points has no additional finite orbits;*
(d) *$M\backslash\{x\} \cong M$ for any point x of M.*

This proposition implies, for example, that the orbits of the stabilizer of a tuple are the infinite open intervals in $\mathbb{Q}$ lying in between the points of the tuple of stabilized points. (For every structure M obeying this proposition there is a homogeneous structure M' with age $Age(M')$ consists of labelled members of $Age(M)$, and $\mathrm{Aut}(M') \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q})$.)

A homogeneous structure has the strong amalgamation property if and only if deleting any finite number of points of its points gives a structure isomorphic to the original. This is the analogue of the coherence condition in Alexander Gnedin's coherence theory of regeneration in random combinatorial structures [**247**], in which removing something from a combinatorial object leaves a copy of what is there before. A single structure cannot have this property, nor can an infinite chain of structures in any interesting way, so Gnedin considered probability distributions on partitions of a positive integer.

A collection of probability distributions on the set of all partitions Π_n of the integer n $(\forall n)$ is (i) *coherent* if subtracting one from a random part of an element of Π_n gives a random element of Π_{n-1}; (ii) *regenerative* if removing an entire part of an element of Π_n gives a random element of the set of partitions of what remains.

There are some distributions to be specified here. For coherence, we could choose the part uniformly, or with probability proportional to its size.

Distributions are described uniformly in two steps, which can be illustrated with an example. Firstly divide the unit interval randomly then colour each interval with a different colour (*Kingman's paintbox*). Secondly, choose n independent random points from the unit interval

according to some possibly new and unrelated distribution. Then we have a partition of n given by the number of points of each colour in the selection.

This gives rise to the distributions which are the cycle lengths of a random permutation. That is, the probability of an element of Π_n is the probability that a random element of the symmetric group $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ has those cycle lengths.

Gnedin has found explicit formulae for the distribution on partitions in many cases.

Now, the random graph is produced by a very simple probability distribution, and has very strong regeneration properties: remove a finite set of vertices or edges, or a finite set of vertices and their common neighbours, or the edges of a locally finite subgraph, and what we obtain is still isomorphic to the random graph.

We have already mentioned the work of Petrov and Vershik who constructed [**429**] an exchangeable measure on countable graphs which is concentrated on Henson's homogeneous universal triangle-free graph (that is, the random graph is isomorphic to Henson's graph with probability 1), and a generalisation of this due to Ackerman, Patel and Freer, who gave a necessary and sufficient condition on a structure M for there to be an exchangeable measure concentrated on M. Their condition is precisely that the stabiliser of a finite set in $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ has only infinite orbits on the remaining points.

Now there is an even closer connection with what Gnedin was talking about. The method used by these five researchers was to define a structure on the real numbers which is almost of the kind desired (thus, in the Petrov-Vershik case, the measure of the set of triangles is zero), and then obtain the countable structure by choosing countably many real numbers independently and taking the induced structure on them.

We ask an open question. What is the deeper connection here with Gnedin's work on probability distributions?

A countable homogeneous structure M has the *strong embedding property* if for all $A \in \mathrm{Age}(M)$ and $x \in A$ and embeddings $e : A\backslash x \to M$ there are infinitely many different extensions of e to embeddings of A into M. The following result is from [**195**]:

A.22. Theorem. *Let M be a countable homogeneous structure. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *M has the strong amalgamation property;*
(b) *M has the strong embedding property;*
(c) *M is strongly inexhaustible.*



FIGURE 2. The Amalgamation Property

The Strong Amalgamation Property has been further strengthened by Macpherson and Tent [**378**], as follows. A Fraïssé class $\mathcal{A}$ has the *Free Amalgamation Property* if, whenever B_1 and B_2 are structures in $\mathcal{A}$ with a common substructure A, there is an amalgam C of B_1 and B_2 such that

(i) the intersection of B_1 and B_2 in C is precisely A (that is, strong amalgamation);
(ii) every instance of a relation in C is contained in either B_1 or B_2.

This holds for graphs: we can choose to make the amalgam so that there are no edges between $B_1 \backslash A$ and $B_2 \backslash A$. They prove the following:

A.23. Theorem. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a nontrivial Fraïssé class (that is, there are some non-trivial relations) with the free amalgamation property, and G the automorphism group of its Fraïssé limit. Then G is simple.*

The trivial case must be excluded, since then G is the symmetric group, which is not simple.

There is a generalization of homogeneity in relational structures, called *pseudo-homogeneity* whose study was initiated by Calais [**77**] and continued by R. Fraïssé who showed [**220**] that if $\mathcal{C}$ is a class of countable structures closed under both isomorphisms and taking induced substructures, then a structure $M \in \mathcal{C}$ is *universal pseudo-homogeneous* if there is a subclass of finite substructures $\mathcal{C}' \subset \mathcal{C}$ satisfying (A4), (A5), and $\mathcal{C}'$ and $\mathcal{C}$ satisfy the following *cofinality condition*: for each finite $A \in \mathcal{C}$, there is a finite $B \in \mathcal{C}'$ so that $A \leq B$.

The subclass $\mathcal{C}$ is called a *pseudo-amalgamation class* [**58**]. There is an infinite universal pseudo-homogeneous graph sharing some of the properties of $\mathfrak{R}$. Taking $\mathcal{C}$ to be the class of all countable graphs and $\mathcal{C}'$ to be the class of all finite graphs, makes $\mathfrak{R}$ universal pseudo-homogeneous.

We mention just one more variation on the basic theory that has been studied. Counting problems for orbits on sets and tuples of oligomorphic permutation groups are identical with those for unlabelled and labelled structures in so-called *oligomorphic Fraïssé classes* of relational structures, which satisfy a stronger version of condition (A2):

(A2') Age(M) contains only finitely many n-element structures up to isomorphism for all n,

These include large numbers of combinatorially important classes of structures, such as graphs, directed graphs, tournaments, partially ordered sets, k-edge-coloured graphs, and graphs with a fixed bipartition. The condition certainly holds if the relational language has

finitely many relations, for example, the random graph or the Fraïssé limit $(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ of the class of finite totally ordered sets.

We mention that there is an unpublished version of Fraïssé's Theorem in the language of Category Theory due to J. Covington.

The age $\mathrm{Age}(M)$ of a relational structure M can be regarded as an example of two different theories:

either

(i) a *species* in the sense of Joyal [**319**] [**39**] [**319**], which is a formal power series where the coefficients are combinatorial objects instead of numerical coefficients, though the former can be reduced to the latter,

or

(ii) as a tree which leads to the study of *ubiquity* [**103**]: a countable homogeneous relational structure M is *ubiquitous in category* if a residual set of structures younger than M are isomorphic to M.

We develop the second of these theories, as it is used in the main text. The nodes of $\mathrm{Age}(M)$ thought of as a tree occur on 'levels' indexed by non-negative integers. The empty set lies at the root of tree. All structures for which $\mathrm{Age}(M)$ has point set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ occur on tree level n. Each node on level $n+1$ is adjacent to the unique level-n node obtained by deleting the point $n+1$, that is the induced substructure on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. An infinite path in the tree corresponds to a structure S on $\mathbb{N}$ whose induced substructure on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ belongs to $\mathrm{Age}(M)$ for all n. By property (A3) above, every finite substructure of S lies in $\mathrm{Age}(M)$, so S is *younger than* M, that is $\mathrm{Age}(S) \subseteq \mathrm{Age}(M)$.

Conversely, if the points of a countable structure S younger than M are indexed by the natural numbers, then the induced substructure of S on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ is a node of the tree for each n, and nodes on consecutive levels are adjacent. So S is represented by a path in the tree. Different enumerations of the points of S give different paths.

So the infinite paths from the root represent the (labelled) structures younger than M.

As explained in the previous section, a metric can be defined on the set $\mathcal{Y}(M)$ of paths by the rule that two paths which agree up to level n and diverge thereafter should have distance $\frac{1}{2^n}$. Any decreasing function can be chosen here, and this one gives the space a diameter of 1. With this metric $\mathcal{Y}(M)$ is a complete metric space.

A set $\mathcal{S}$ of paths (that is structures younger than M) is *open* if and only if it is *finitely determined*, meaning that for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists n such that any structure in $\mathcal{Y}(M)$ which induces the same structure

on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ as S, belongs to $\mathcal{S}$. For the ball of radius $\frac{1}{2^n}$ containing S consists of all structures agreeing with S on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$.

A set $\mathcal{S}$ is *dense* if and only if it is *always reachable*, meaning that any finite structure is induced by some member of $\mathcal{S}$. In other words, $\mathcal{S}$ meets all open balls, whose definition in given in a later section.

We will continue with the discussion of ages and ubiquity after defining random graphs in the next section.

The homogeneous structures among various classes that have been determined include posets by Schmerl [**475**], tournaments by Lachlan [**345**] permutations by Cameron [**109**] and digraphs by Cherlin [**139**].

There are two noteworthy recent developments in the theory of homogeneous structures and Fraïssé classes. The first one makes connections with Ramsey theory; in particular, if the age of a structure with an explicit or implicit order is a Ramsey class then it is a Fraïssé class [**295**]. The second one makes connections with topological dynamics, for example in [**326**] [**327**] it is shown that the automorphism groups of homogeneous structures have very strong amenability properties. We refer to [**115**, §3.4] for a brief account of these.

Fraïssé's original theory [**220**] has been greatly extended in a number of directions, a sample of which are [**121**] [**119**] [**160**] [**185**] [**195**] [**281**] [**285**] [**293**] [**295**] [**317**] [**318**] [**326**] [**436**]. Hrushovski's theory in essence requires only some instances of amalgamation to be possible, enabling the construction of many new types of structures and permutation groups; a detailed discussion of it is given in Wagner's expository article in [**325**]. Homogeneous structures arise in many areas of mathematics; for example the connection with Ramsey theory is studied by Hubička and Nešetřil in [**295**] [**412**], and in [**297**] they prove the existence of countably universal structures for every class of structures determined by finitely many forbidden homomorphisms. Arbitrary relational structures on an infinite groundset satisfying a finiteness hypothesis stating that there are only finitely many isomorphism types of substructures of size a certain infinite cardinality condition is studied in [**237**].

Several parts of model theory are increasingly becoming standard tools in various areas of mathematics. For example, for constructions of special Banach spaces in Banach space theory and in Metric space theory and oscillation of such spaces. There are papers of Uspenskij and others working in the theory of large group actions.

Especially noteworthy is the fundamental paper by Kechris, Pestov and Todorcevic [**326**] because it opened up a new research direction, and we give a brief introduction to one of the main results.

A class $\mathbf{C}$ has the *Ramsey property* if for any two structures $A, B \in \mathbf{C}$ and any positive integer m there exists a structure $C \in \mathbf{C}$ such that if the substructures of C isomorphic to A are coloured with m colours, then there is a substructure isomorphic to B such that all its A-substructures have the same colour. If $\mathbf{C}$ consists of sets with no structure then this property reduces to the classical form of Ramsey's theorem.

Recall that the automorphism group of a countable structure $\mathcal{M}$ is a topological group with the topology of pointwise convergence. A *flow* for a topological group G is a continuous action of G on a compact Hausdorff space. The group G is *extremely amenable* if every flow for G has a fixed point. More generally, any group has a *universal minimal flow*: it is extremely amenable if the universal minimal flow is a space with a single point.

The theorem of Kechris, Pestov and Todorcevic mentioned above states:

The age of a countable homogeneous structure with a total order is a Ramsey class if and only if its automorphism group is extremely amenable.

This was an unexpected confluence of homogeneous structures, Ramsey theory and topological dynamics. The countable dense linear order without endpoints (the rational numbers as ordered set) are an example of a homogeneous structure with this property.

Lionel Nguyen Van Thé, together with Yonatan Gutman and Todor Tsankov showed [**418**] that a Fraïssé class of structures has an expansion (obtained by adding extra relations) with the Ramsey property if and only if the automorphism group of its Fraïssé limit has an extremely amenable subgroup with precompact quotient.

The Glasner-Weiss theorem states that the universal minimal flow for the symmetric group of countable degree is the action on the class of linear orders of the countable set. Tsankov classified the minimal flows for this group. The arguments required for this classification were produced by Claude Frasnay in the 1960s, in a totally different context.

More topics were discussed at the 2nd Workshop on Homogeneous Structures held in Prague in July 2012.

5. The Random Graph $\mathfrak{R}$

In 1963, Erdős and Rényi [**202**] proved the following remarkable theorem.

A.24. Theorem. *There is a countable graph $\mathfrak{R}$ with the following property: Suppose that a graph on a given countable vertex set is chosen at random by selecting edges independently with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ from the set of unordered pairs of vertices. Then, with probability 1, the resulting random graph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$.*

This *countable random graph* $\mathfrak{R}$ is the prototype and motivation for what we have described in this book. Accordingly, we give a brief introduction to this graph and its properties in this Appendix, referring to [**103**] for further details.

The proof of the Erdős–Rényi theorem is surprisingly easy; we now sketch it. It depends on the following property $(*)$ which may or may not be satisfied by a given graph:

> For any finite disjoint sets U, V of vertices, there is a vertex z which is joined to every vertex in U and to none in V.

Now the Erdős–Rényi theorem follows immediately from the following two facts, whose proofs we sketch:

Fact 1: With probability 1, the random countable graph satisfies $(*)$.

Fact 2: Any two countable graphs satisfying $(*)$ are isomorphic.

Proof of Fact 1: Since there are only a countable number of disjoint pairs (U, V) of finite sets, and a countable union of null sets is null, it suffices to show that the failure of $(*)$ for a particular choice of U and V has probability 0. But if $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_N$ are vertices outside $S = U \cup V$, the probability that none of $z_1, \ldots, z_N$ is "correctly" joined to S is $(1 - 1/2^{|S|})^N$, which tends to 0 as $N \to \infty$, as required.

Proof of Fact 2: Let X_1 and X_2 be countable graphs satisfying condition $(*)$; assume that we have an enumeration of the vertices of each of these graphs. We construct an isomorphism between them by the method of back-and-forth, as the union of a sequence of finite partial isomorphisms. Start with the empty partial isomorphism f_0. At an odd-numbered stage, let x be the first vertex of X_1 not in the domain of the current partial isomorphism f_n; use property $(*)$ of the graph X_2 to find a vertex y such that the extension f_{n+1} of f_n which maps x to y is a partial isomorphism. At an even-numbered stage, let y be the first vertex of X_2 not in the range of f_n, and use property $(*)$ for X_1 to find a suitable pre-image x.

The proof gives further information about the random graph.

A.25. THEOREM. (1) $\mathfrak{R}$ *is* universal*: that is, every finite or countable graph can be embedded as an induced subgraph of* $\mathfrak{R}$*.*
(2) $\mathfrak{R}$ *is* homogeneous*: that is, every isomorphism between finite induced subgraphs of* $\mathfrak{R}$ *can be extended to an automorphism of* $\mathfrak{R}$*.*

PROOF. For both parts, we use a modification of the "back-and-forth" method. For the first, note that going in the forward direction only requires that $(*)$ holds in X_2, and if we take all our steps in this direction we construct an embedding (rather than an isomorphism) from an arbitrary graph to X_2. For the second, given a finite partial isomorphism g of $\mathcal{R}$, take $X_1 = X_2 = \mathcal{R}$, and modify the back-and-forth by starting with g rather than the empty map. □

The Erdős–Rényi theorem gives a non-constructive existence proof for the graph $\mathfrak{R}$: an event with probability 1 is certainly non-empty! In order to give an explicit construction, all we need to do is to verify that the constructed graph has property $(*)$. We give three such constructions. The first was given by Rado [**453**] in 1964.

First construction The vertex set is the set $\mathbb{N}$ of natural numbers (including zero). Given two distinct vertices x and y, suppose (without loss of generality) that $x < y$; then join x to y if and only if the xth digit in the base 2 representation of y is equal to 1.

Let U and V be finite disjoint sets of vertices. By enlarging U if necessary, we can assume that $\max(U) > \max(V)$. Now it is straightforward to show that $z = \sum_{u \in U} 2^u$ satisfies the requirements of $(*)$.

Second construction The vertex set is the set of primes congruent to 1 mod 4. Join vertices p and q if and only if p is a quadratic residue mod q. By the Law of Quadratic Reciprocity, this is a symmetric adjacency relation.

Let U and V be finite disjoint sets of vertices. Choose a quadratic non-residue a_v for each $v \in V$. By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, there is a solution to the simultaneous congruences

$$\begin{aligned} x &\equiv 1 \bmod u \quad \text{for all } u \in U; \\ x &\equiv a_v \bmod v \quad \text{for all } v \in V; \\ x &\equiv 1 \bmod 4; \end{aligned}$$

the solution is unique modulo $N = 4 \prod_{u \in U} u \prod_{v \in V} v$. By Dirichlet's Theorem, this arithmetic theorem contains a prime, which gives the required value of z.

Third construction By the downward Löwenheim–Skolem theorem of first-order logic, if the Zermelo-Fraenkel axioms for set theory are consistent, then they have a countable model; that is, there is a countable set X, with a binary relation $\in$ on it, for which the axioms are satisfied. We take the vertex set to be X, and join x to y if and only if either $x \in y$ or $y \in x$ (in other words, adjacency is symmetrised membership).

Let U and V be finite disjoint subsets of X. Using the Pairing, Union and Foundation axioms, it is easy to construct an element z which contains all the elements of U and none of the elements of V.

Note that only the three axioms mentioned are used in this proof. This means that we obtain the random graph, whether or not the other axioms (such as Choice or Infinity) are satisfied. Indeed, Rado's construction can be regarded as obtained by this method using a hereditarily finite model of set theory (in which all sets are finite).

Remark Since $\mathfrak{R}$ is homogeneous, its automorphism group is very large: it acts transitively on vertices, edges, non-edges, and indeed on any isomorphism type of finite subgraphs. But each of our three constructions of $\mathfrak{R}$ has the property that no non-trivial automorphisms are "obvious" from the construction.

6. $\aleph_0$-categoricity

Let L be a countable first-order language. A theory in L is said to be $\aleph_0$-*categorical* if it has a unique countable model; and a countable L-structure is $\aleph_0$-*categorical* if its theory is, that is, if it is the unique countable model of its theory (up to isomorphism).

Two examples of $\aleph_0$-categorical theories are:

- the rational numbers $\mathbb{Q}$, as ordered set (this follows from Cantor's theorem characterising $\mathbb{Q}$ as the unique countable dense linear order without endpoints);
- the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ (this follows because condition $(*)$ in the preceding section is first-order, being the conjunction of infinitely many $\forall\exists$ sentences, one for each pair of values of $|U|$ and $|V|$).

On the other hand, Peano's axioms for the natural numbers, or the Zermelo–Fraenkel axioms for set theory, are not $\aleph_0$-categorical (assuming that they are consistent), since in each case there are many countable models. (For Peano's axioms, these are the "non-standard models of arithmetic"; for ZF there are, for example, models with and without the axiom of choice, and by the downward Löwenheim–Skolem theorem there are countable models in each case.)

The remarkable theorem of Engeler, Ryll–Nardzewski and Svenonius characterises the $\aleph_0$-categorical countable structures in terms of their symmetry.

A.26. THEOREM. *A structure M over the first-order language M is $\aleph_0$-categorical if and only if* $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ *has only finitely many orbits on M^n for each natural number n.*

A permutation group is said to be *oligomorphic* if it has only finitely any orbits on the nth Cartesian power of the permutation domain for each natural number n. (So a structure M is $\aleph_0$-categorical if and only if its automorphism group is oligomorphic.) It is easy to see that we may equivalently ask for finitely many orbits on the set of n-tuples of distinct elements, or on the set of n-element subsets for each n.

To illustrate, we look again at our two examples of $\aleph_0$-categorical structures.

- $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ has just one orbit on n-element subsets of $\mathbb{Q}$, for each n: for given two such subsets, it is easy to find a piecewise-linear order-preserving permutation carrying one to the other.
- Since $\mathfrak{R}$ is homogeneous, the number of orbits on n-element subsets is equal to the number of graphs with n vertices, which is clearly finite. So $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is oligomorphic.

Extending the argument in the second example, we see that if M is any countable homogeneous structure, then the number of $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$-orbits on n-tuples is equal to the number of n-element substructures of M up to isomorphism. If the language L is a finite relational language, then this number is finite. We conclude that

> A countable homogeneous structure over a finite relational language is $\aleph_0$-categorical.

We see, for example, that a countable model of ZF is not $\aleph_0$-categorical, but that if we symmetrise the membership relation, the resulting graph is $\aleph_0$-categorical (and indeed we get the same graph, no matter what model of ZF we chose).

As for the first example, the $\aleph_0$-categoricity of the rationals with the usual ordering $(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ which was proved by Cantor, was generalized by by Skolem [**493**] who showed that it is possible to partition $\mathbb{Q}$ by adding finitely many dense and cofinal subsets. The Covington graph $\mathfrak{N}$ can be described in terms of a dense codense colouring of the rationals [**108**]. We conjecture that it is possible to realize it as a Cayley graph that can be constructed from a conjugacy-class generating set. (By contrast a countable N-free graph admits at most one conjugacy class of cyclic automorphisms) [**90**, p.96]. It may also be possible to

build other structure-free graphs, such as square-free W-free graphs, using conditions similar to those parameterizing N-free graphs [**90**, p.97].

We end with some pedagogical remarks regarding the categoricity of random graphs. Whilst the two-coloured random graph is known to be $\aleph_0$-categorical it is not $\aleph_1$-categorical. The higher-adjacency random graph $\mathfrak{R}_{\omega,\omega}$ is not $\aleph_0$-categorical if we regard colours as "named" relations, but it is if we simply take the structure as a partition of edges into colour classes. It is unlikely to be $\aleph_1$-categorical. Because $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ is not $\aleph_1$-categorical there is no unique uncountable random graph, so it is not clear what an object like $\mathfrak{R}_{\kappa_1,\kappa_2}$ where the κ_i are chosen uncountable cardinals, actually is but this may be an interesting question for set-theorists.

Another discussion of $\aleph_0$-categoricity can be found in [**325**]. We refer also to [**50**] for extensions of interpretability in $\aleph_0$-categorical structures.

7. Mathematics and Logic

Logic plays a dual role in mathematics; it provides the foundations on which the subject is built, and it is a branch of mathematics in its own right developing by using the common culture of mathematics, and makes its own very important contributions to this culture. Let's expand on this observation.

The *Deduction Theorem* asserts that, if a proposition q can be deduced from a set S of propositions together with an extra proposition p, then the proposition $p \vDash q$ can be deduced from S alone. The proof, of course, is by induction on the number of steps in the assumed proof of q.

Now a formula p is logically valid if it is true in every interpretation, and is a logical consequence of a set S if it is true in all interpretations which make every formula in S true.

Finally we can say what soundness and completeness are. A system is sound if all its theorems are logically valid, and is complete if all its logically valid formulas are theorems. A sound system is free of contradiction, since a contradiction cannot be logically valid. Clearly soundness is an essential requirement, and completeness a desirable requirement, for any logical system which is to serve as a basis of mathematics.

Two very important and familiar logical systems are sound and complete. The first of these is propositional (or Boolean) logic, where

atomic propositions have no internal structure, but are simply statements which are either true or false and are combined with connectives such as "and", "or", "not", "implies". We can decide whether a compound proposition is logically valid by constructing a truth table for it; there are standard deduction systems for propositional logic which prove precisely the logically valid formulas.

Secondly there is first-order logic, which is the formalism in which most of mathematics is naturally cast. Its structure has constants, functions, and variables which are combined into 'atomic' propositions by means of relations (including the relation of equality); these are then joined by connectives as in the Boolean case, or bound by quantifiers over variables such as "for all x, ..." or "there exists x such that ..." Gödel proved that first-order logic is complete. *Gödel's Completeness Theorem* says that in first-order logic, truth and provability are equivalent. Higher-order logics have sound deductive systems, but no such system can be complete; (though second-order logic is complete for Henkin semantics).

Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem asserts something more specific. Any logical system provided with axioms which attempts to describe the natural numbers with the operations of addition and multiplication and the relation of order, if it is consistent, must be "incomplete", in the sense that there are true statements about the natural numbers which are not provable. Of course, by the completeness theorem, any statement which is true in all models of the axioms is provable. So this is actually a constructive theorem: it says that any axiom system which attempts to describe the natural numbers, if consistent, will always have 'non-standard models', structures which satisfy the axioms but fail to have some property which is true of the natural numbers.

This is quite subtle. It is known that the theory of the natural numbers, with the order relation and the operation of addition but without multiplication is complete: this is *Pressberger arithmetic* [**449**]. Somehow throwing in multiplication as well makes the difference, despite the truism that "multiplication can be defined in terms of addition". Not to mention *Skolem Arithmetic*, where the operation of multiplication is kept but addition is thrown away, which is also complete. Mojżesz Presburger proved Presburger arithmetic to be: consistent, complete and decidable, that is, there exists an algorithm which decides whether any given statement in Presburger arithmetic is true or false. Robinson arithmetic (Q), is a finitely axiomatised fragment of Peano arithmetic (PA), first set out in [**462**] by Raphael Robinson. This is essentially PA without the axiom schema of induction. Since it is weaker than PA, it

is incomplete in the sense of Gödel, but crucially this weak finitely axiomatised theory is already incompletable and essentially undecidable. More on these matters can be found in [**66**] and [**384**].

The desirable properties of a logical system, soundness and completeness, mean that a formula f is provable if and only if it is true in all interpretations. More generally, a formula f is provable from a set S of formulas if it is true in all interpretations satisfying all the formulas in S.

This last property has an important consequence: a set S of formulas is consistent (no contradiction can be proved from it) if and only if it is satisfiable (true in some interpretation). For a contradiction is true in no interpretation, so is deducible from S if and only if S is true in no interpretation.

Consistency was a matter of great signficance to Hilbert and his followers. Part of Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem states that a logical system which is at least strong enough to include the theory of the natural numbers (with order, addition, and multiplication) cannot prove its own consistency. For example, Peano's axioms, the commonest such system for the natural numbers, cannot prove their own consistency.

The vast majority of mathematicians accept the existence of the natural numbers. It is easy to see that they do indeed satisfy Peano's axioms. So, as stated above, this shows that the axioms are consistent.

Another take on this is to consider the Zermelo-Fraenkel (ZF) axioms for set theory. Set theory is generally accepted as the standard foundation, in which everything that mathematicians study can be built. The Zermelo-Fraenkel axioms are strong enough to prove the consistency of the Peano axioms because the natural numbers can be constructed in set theory.

Of course this only pushes the difficulty elsewhere, since the ZF axioms cannot prove their own consistency. But ZF with a "large cardinal axiom" proves the consistency of ZF. The higher we go, the smaller proportion of mathematicians accept the axioms, of course. While few doubt the existence of the natural numbers, "inaccessible cardinals" are more problematic.

We mention in passing a popular fad, which is to regard category theory rather than set theory as the natural foundation for mathematics. But the foundational difficulties with category theory (the large cardinal axioms that have to be assumed) are much stronger than for set theory!

Briefly, the construction of numbers in set theory. Numbers are for counting; like the standard metre, the standard number 2 should be a 2-element set against which other sets can be compared to see if

they have 2 elements. The standard set 0 must be the empty set (it follows from the Axiom of Extensionality that there is only one empty set, so we have no choice). Then the standard 1-element set should be the only one we have at this point, namely the set 0; the standard 2-element set 0,1 (in other words, 0,0); and so on. Each number is the set of its predecessors.

To return to the incompleteness theorem, the existence of true but unprovable statements in a theory at least as strong as Peano's. We have to look at what appear to be ways to circumvent this. If f is true but unprovable, no contradiction would be introduced by simply adding f as a new axiom. But Gödel's argument still applies, and gives a true but unprovable statement in the new theory; and so on ad infinitum.

Adding all true statements as axioms also fails, because one of our requirements for a logical system is that there should be a mechanical procedure for recognising the axioms; and there is no mechanical procedure for recognising true statements about the natural numbers. (This was Alan Turing's great contribution; but in a sense, it must be so, else Gödel's theorem would be false. Turing gave a precise definition of a "mechanical procedure" by inventing the Turing machine, the theoretical computer which is the prototype for our real computers.)

What do these true but unprovable statements look like? They have the property that Gödel required of them; but, if written out as logical statements in terms of order, addition and multiplication on the natural numbers, they are entirely unnatural (and dependent on the particular axiom system chosen).

There was considerable excitement in the 1970s when Jeff Paris and Leo Harrington found the first example of a "natural" true but unprovable statement. (There was also Gerhard Gentzen's 1943 direct proof of the unprovability of ϵ_0-induction in Peano arithmetic, and Goodstein's Theorem). Their statement was a variant of Ramsey's theorem, to which we shall return shortly. (We mention Harvey Friedman's work on *reverse mathematics*, whose aim is to derive the axioms of mathematics from the theorems considered to be necessary. One aspect of this is his *Boolean relation theory*, which attempts to justify large cardinal axioms by demonstrating their necessity for deriving certain important propositions.)

It is very nearly true that no statement which mathematicians had previously invested time and effort in trying to prove has ever turned out to be undecidable. (The exception to this is the Continuum Hypothesis, the statement that there is no set intermediate in size between the natural numbers and the real numbers. In 1960, Paul Cohen showed

that it is independent of the ZF axioms. This means that, rather like geometry where we can study either Euclidean or non-Euclidean geometry (or both), we can do mathematics in which the Continuum Hypothesis is true, or in which it is false.) So the syntactic aspect of logic is not much of a concern.

However results such as Gödel's Completeness Theorem for first-order logic have important consequences for ordinary mathematics. Here are two of them, which can be regarded as the portals of model theory. (A model for a set S of formulas is a structure in which the formulas of S are true. This is entirely a semantic notion.) Let S be a set of sentences (formulas with no free variables) in a first-order language which has at most countably many symbols in its alphabet.

The Compactness Theorem: If every finite subset of S has a model, then S has a model. *The Downward Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem*: If S has a model, then it has a model which is at most countably infinite.

We comment briefly on the proofs. According to soundness and completeness, the statement "S has a model" is equivalent to "S is consistent". Now if S is inconsistent, then a contradiction can be proved from it; since proofs are finite, the contradiction must follow from a finite subset of S. This proves compactness. The Downward Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem relies on the fact that, in the proof of completeness, it is necessary to construct a model for a consistent set of sentences; observing the proof we see that the model constructed is at most countably infinite.

Ramsey's Theorem has a rather complicated statement. The easiest finite form of it is the party theorem: given any number k, there is a number $n = R(k)$ such that, among any given n people, there are either k mutual friends or k mutual strangers. (We assume that any two people are either friends or strangers. The proof that $R(3) = 6$ is well-known.) This can be formulated (and proved) in Peano arithmetic. But there is an infinite form: given an infinite number of people, there are either infinitely many mutual friends or infinitely many mutual strangers. This is a theorem of set theory which can be proved from the ZF axioms. Now the Compactness Theorem shows that the finite party theorem is a consequence of the infinite one.

The *Paris-Harrington Theorem* [**427**], alluded to before, is a generalised version of Ramsey's Theorem. The 'party' version says that, given k, there is a number $n = PH(k)$ such that, given n people $p_0, \ldots, p_{n-1}$, there is a set of at least k people, mutual friends or mutual strangers, so that if the least-numbered person in the set is pm, then there are more than m people in the set.

The theorem can be deduced from the infinite Ramsey theorem by exactly the same compactness argument that gives the finite Ramsey theorem. But, although it can be formulated in the language of Peano arithmetic, it cannot be proved from Peano's axioms for the interesting reason that the appropriate "Paris-Harrington function" grows so rapidly that it cannot be expressed in terms of the functions of arithmetic!

We complete this section with another connection, one that makes transparent the relevance of the above to our study in this manuscript.

By the Upward Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem, a theory which has infinite models will have arbitrarily large infinite models; so no set of first-order axioms can uniquely specify an infinite structure. The next best thing is to specify a structure once the size is given. The case of most relevance to us is the following.

A set S of first-order sentences is *countably categorical* if it has only one countable model up to isomorphism. A countable structure with countably categorical theory is thus one which can be completely specified by a set of first-order axioms together with the extra assertion that it is countable. The prototype Cantor's theorem characterising $\mathbb{Q}$ as the unique countable dense total order without endpoints. (The conditions of being totally ordered and without endpoints are first-order statements.)

Now we repeat the theorem proved independently in 1959 by three people, Engeler, Ryll-Nardzewski, and Svenonius:

A countable structure M has countably categorical theory if and only if its automorphism group has only finitely many orbits on the set of n-tuples of elements of M for all natural numbers n.

In other words, axiomatisability (by countability and first-order axioms) is equivalent to symmetry (for the condition of the theorem asserts that such a structure has a huge and rich group of automorphisms). This equivalence of axiomatisability and symmetry is surely one of the most remarkable facts in mathematics.

Oligomorphic permutation groups which have only finitely many orbits on n-tuples for all n, different orbits representing different "shapes" of n-tuples, and only a few (i.e. finitely many) such shapes are required to satisfy the condition. These groups are essentially just the automorphism groups of structures with countably categorical theories. Given an oligomorphic permutation group, and consider the number of its orbits on n-tuples. Call a sequence of natural numbers realisable if it arises in this way.

Which sequences are realisable? We are very far from a complete answer to this question; but here are two general remarks.

By the Downward Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem, if a sequence is realisable, then it is realisable by a countable group acting on a countable set. So this theory is not plagued with difficulties about "large cardinals". By the Compactness Theorem, a sequence is realisable if and only if every (finite) initial subsequence of it is an initial subsequence of some realisable sequence. So realisability is a "finitely determined" property.

8. Previous Results in Multicoloured Random Graph Theory

Ours is not the first study of multi-adjacency random graphs. They have been analysed before by J. K. Truss as countable universal homogeneous C-coloured graphs $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ for $|C| \geq 2$ [**527**] [**529**], using detailed permutation group theory. Whilst our results are complementary to these works, it is appropriate to list their main findings.

Among the results of [**527**] are:-

(i) $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ is simple for each C. (Clearly for $|C| = 1$, $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(\aleph_0)$ which has $\mathrm{FSym}(\aleph_0)$ as a normal subgroup).

(ii) Non-identity members of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ have infinite support $\forall\ C$. (Clearly not true for $|C| = 1$).

(iii) Different cycle types arise, depending on C.

(iv) For each C with $2 \leq |C| \leq \aleph_0$, $\exists g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ of cycle type $(k_\infty, k_1, k_2, k_3, \ldots) = (n, 1, 0, 0, \ldots)$ $\forall n \geq |C|$, but for $m < |C|$ none of type $(m, 1, 0, 0, \ldots)$. Hence $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C) \cong \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_{C'})$ as *permutation groups iff* $|C| = |C'|$. (M. Rubin [**466**] has shown that the $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ are non-isomorphic for different values of $|C|$).

(v) For each C with $2 \leq |C| < \aleph_0$, Γ_C is $\aleph_0$-categorical.

(vi) The group $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_{\aleph_0})$ has a subgroup isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sym}(\aleph_0)$.

(vii) For $|C| \geq 1$, $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ contains two subgroups isomorphic to $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_{C+1})$ whose intersection is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_{C+2})$.

(viii) There is a subgroup chain $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_1) = H_1 > H_2 > \ldots > H_\infty$ such that for all $n \leq \infty$, $H_n \cong \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_n)$ and $H_\infty = \cap_{n<\infty} H_n$. (Clearly any extra structure imposed on Γ_n restricts the class of automorphisms, so defines a subgroup).

(ix) For any C, C' with $1 \leq |C|, |C'| \leq \aleph_0$, $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_{C'})$. So for example, each of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_1)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_2)$ can be embedded as a subgroup of the other; note however that $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_2)$ is simple whilst $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_1)$ is not.

In [**527**] Truss showed that five conjugates suffice to prove that $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ is simple, that is any non-identity element can be expressed as the product of five conjugates of any other non-identity element. In [**533**] this was improved to three conjugates. We give an outline of

the form of the original proof and refer the reader to the articles for a detailed discussion.

Let C be the set of edge-colours and $F : E(\Gamma_C) \to C$ be the colouring function on the edges. Let Σ be the set of all $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ which are an infinite product of disjoint infinite cycles (with no finite cycles) for which: if α maps a finite subset of Γ_C into C then $\exists x \in \Gamma_C \setminus \mathrm{dom}(\alpha)$ such that $xg^n \notin \mathrm{dom}(\alpha)$ $(\forall n \in \mathbb{Z})$ and $F\{x, y\} = \alpha(y)$ $(\forall y \in \mathrm{dom}(\alpha))$. Call any x that satisfies the formula $(\exists x)(\forall y \in \mathrm{dom}(\alpha))F\{x, y\} = \alpha(y)$ a *witness* for the formula. Witnesses for the formula lie outside any cycles of elements of Σ containing members of $\mathrm{dom}(\alpha)$. Firstly two lemmas are proved:

A.27. Lemma. *If $1 \neq g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ then $\{x \in \Gamma_C : gx \neq x\}$ is infinite.*

So non-identity members of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ have infinite support. Truss comments that this appears to be the only point in the proof of the simplicity of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ where $|C| \geq 2$ is used.

A.28. Lemma. *If $1 \neq g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, α maps a finite subset of Γ_C into C, and A is a finite subset of Γ_C, then $\exists x \in \Gamma_C$ such that*

$$(\forall i)(-n \leq i \leq n) \Rightarrow xg^i \notin A \cup \mathrm{dom}(\alpha)),\ xg \neq x$$

and

$$(\forall y \in \mathrm{dom}(\alpha))\ F\{x, y\} = \alpha(y).$$

So infinitely many of the witnesses are moved by g.

Then the following two results are proved:

A.29. Theorem. *If $1 \neq g_1, g_2 \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ then there is a conjugate h of g_1 such that $g_2 h \in \Sigma$.*

So there are conjugates g_1, g_2 of g^{-1} such that $g^{-1}g_1, hg_2 \in \Sigma$.

A.30. Theorem. *If $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in \Sigma$ then there are conjugates h_1, h_2, h_3 of g_1, g_2, g_3 such that $h_3 h_2 h_1 = 1$.*

So there are conjugates h_1, h_2 of $g^{-1}g_1$ and h_3 of hg_2 such that $h_3 h_2 h_1 = 1$.

Putting these together, $h_3 = h_1^{-1} h_2^{-1} = 1$, so h_3 is the product of four conjugates of g. Hence so is hg_2, and so if g and h are non-identity elements of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$, then h is the product of five conjugates of g. So $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ is simple.

In [**529**], $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ is extended to a highly transitive permutation group $\mathrm{AAut}(\Gamma_C)$ on the same set by considering "almost automorphisms" of Γ, these being permutations g of Γ_C for which the set of two-element subsets $\{x, y\}$ of Γ_C such that $\{x, y\}$ is a different colour to

$\{gx, gy\}$ is finite; that is permutations of Γ_C which preserve the colour of all but a finite set of edges.

Among the results of [**529**] are:-

(i) The lattice of non-trivial normal subgroups N of $\mathrm{AAut}(\Gamma_C)$ are isomorphic to the lattice of subgroups of the free abelian group of rank n, where $n = |C| - 1$. In particular $\mathrm{AAut}(\Gamma_C)$ has a unique minimal non-trivial normal subgroup.
(ii) Any non-trivial normal subgroup N of $\mathrm{AAut}(\Gamma_C)$ contains $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$.
(iii) Cycle types occurring in $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ and $\mathrm{AAut}(\Gamma_C)$ are the same apart from those which are the product of finitely many cycles.

A classification of all the cycle types occurring in the automorphism groups of countable homogeneous graphs can be found in [**365**].

A word which is an element of a free group on a finite set for which every equation of the form $w = g$ for an element g of a given group G is soluble, is said to be *universal* for G. In [**188**] Droste and Truss prove special cases of the conjecture that a word is universal for $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)$ if and only if it cannot be written as a proper power, a result already established for infinite symmetric groups.

Finally, M. Rubin has proved the following results:-

(i) If the automorphism group of a countable homogeneous graph (the varieties are classified by the Lachlan-Woodrow Theorem) is primitive then it is simple.
(ii) The stabilizer $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma_C)_{(X)}$ is a simple group for finite $X \subseteq \Gamma_C$.

Combinatorial aspects of random graph colourings are explored in [**410**], but these refer to finite graphs in contrast to our emphasis on the infinite.

9. Further Details on Random Graphs

Let $V(\Gamma)$ denote the vertex set of graph Γ and $E(\Gamma)$ its edge set. The *trivial graph* consists of just one vertex. A bijection $\alpha : V(\Gamma) \to V(\Gamma')$ between two graphs Γ and Γ' is an *isomorphism* if $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma) \Leftrightarrow \{\alpha(u), \alpha(v)\} \in E(\Gamma')$. An *automorphism* is a self-isomorphism. The set of automorphisms of Γ under the operation of composition form a group, denoted $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$, and its elements permute the vertices of Γ so as to leave invariant its edges. For more on graph automorphisms see [**112**] [**352**]. A *graph invariant* is a map which assigns equal values to isomorphic graphs. One of the simplest graph

invariant is the *diameter* of a connected graph, which is the maximal distance between pairs of its vertices.

Presently we shall explain why the *random graph* $\mathfrak{R}$ is the unique countably infinite graph [**54**, p. 241] whose defining relation is either given by the $(*)$-condition:

$(*)$ If U and V are finite disjoint sets of vertices of $\mathfrak{R}$, then there exists in $\mathfrak{R}$ a vertex z joined to every vertex in U and to no vertex in V;

or equivalently, by the one-point extension property:

$(\dagger)$ If $A \subset B$ are finite graphs with A the induced subgraph of B obtained by deleting one vertex, then any embedding of A into graph $\mathfrak{R}$ can be extended to an embedding of B into $\mathfrak{R}$.

Condition $(\dagger)$ is called the *I-property* because it is a form of injectivity. Clearly, $(\dagger)$ is equivalent to the property $(*)$, which is just its interpretation for graphs. The back-and-forth method shows the uniqueness of a countable graph satisfying them. An example of the back-and-forth argument proving uniqueness, and its extension proving homogeneity for a slightly different random graph can be found in Chapter 1.

Property $(*)$ is a conjunction of one first-order sentence per application (or per value of $|U \cup V|$), so $\mathfrak{R}$ is $\aleph_0$-categorical and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is oligomorphic. Property $(\dagger)$ implies that $\mathfrak{R}$ is *universal*, that is that any finite or countable subgraph of $\mathfrak{R}$ is embeddable in $\mathfrak{R}$ as an induced subgraph. One further property of $\mathfrak{R}$ is its *homogeneity*, meaning that any isomorphism between finite subgraphs of $\mathfrak{R}$ can be extended to an automorphism of $\mathfrak{R}$. Homogeneity is a measure of the symmetry of a mathematical object. It is quite a general symmetry property that for graphs includes as special cases the properties of vertex-, edge- and path-transitivity. The graph $\mathfrak{R}$ is the unique countable homogeneous universal graph.

An $\aleph_0$-categorical structure is universal, as can be proved [**91**] using König's Infinity Lemma [**338**].

A homogeneous structure is universal, as proved in [**91**].

P. Komjáth and J. Pach survey [**337**] results in the theory of universal graphs with different properties, including examples of classes of graphs for which there is no universal element, for example, the class of K_ω-free countably infinite graphs.

A graph is *n-existentially closed* or *n-e.c.* if for every pair of subsets U, W of the vertex set $V(\Gamma)$ of the graph such that $U \cap W = \varnothing$ and $|U| + |W| = n$, there is a vertex $v \in V(\Gamma) \backslash (U \cup W)$ such that all edges between v and U are present and no edges between v and W are present. So another name for property $(*)$ is the *existentially closed* or *e.c.*

adjacency property. This leads to stability properties such as for each $v \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\mathfrak{R} \cong \mathfrak{R}\backslash\{v\}$. The n-e.c. property first arose in the discussion of random graphs and the zero-one law for first-order sentences [**245**] (see below), but it is more general. Let M be a homogeneous relational structure with age $\mathrm{Age}(M)$. Then (†) is the e.c. property that holds in M for any finite substructures $A, B \subseteq \mathrm{Age}(M)$ of M with $|B| = |A| + 1$. We say that a finite S is *n-e.c.* with respect to $\mathrm{Age}(M)$ if

(i) $S \in \mathrm{Age}(M)$;
(ii) (†) holds for all $A, B \in \mathrm{Age}(M)$ with $|A| \leq n$;

The following question arises: when can we find finite n-e.c. structures for a Fraïssé class $\mathrm{Age}(M)$, and how large do they have to be in terms of n? For graphs, a lower bound $2^n + n$ is known, and an upper bound has been derived from Paley graphs. Almost all random graphs are n-e.c. [**124**].

The book by Higman and Scott [**281**] is an account of the theory of existentially closed groups.

The structure of the graph $\mathfrak{R}$ can be generalized by increasing the number of different adjacency types from two to any number. In this manuscript we shall mostly be interested in the three-adjacency case. These three can more conveniently be thought of as colours, red, blue and green $(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ thereby giving the *triality graph* $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, which is the 3-colour generalization of $\mathfrak{R}$, with a modified injectivity property which is an interpretation of (†) for 3-coloured complete graphs:

$(*_t)$ If U, V and W are finite disjoint sets of vertices of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, then there exist in $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, a vertex z, joined to every vertex in U with a red edge, to every vertex in V with a blue edge, and to every vertex in W with a green edge.

The m-coloured random graph for $m \geq 3$ edge colours is similarly defined and is denoted $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$, where ω denotes a countable infinity of vertices; so $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}} = \mathfrak{R}_{3,\omega}$.

The graphs $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ are also universal and homogeneous, and the proofs of this are similar to those given in the main text for $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. Another measure of symmetry is the size of an object's automorphism group. Most graphs, certainly finite ones, are *asymmetric*, that is they possess a trivial automorphism group consisting solely of the identity element. By contrast the automorphism group of $\mathfrak{R}$ and its multicoloured versions are gigantic, being uncountably infinite in size, thereby indicating a colossal degree of symmetry possessed by these graphs.

In short then, the multicoloured graph $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ has similar structural properties to the two-coloured graph $\mathfrak{R}$. However there are differences in the structure of the groups supported by the graphs, as will unfold

in the main text. Whenever we say 'the random graph', we mean the two-coloured random graph. A random countable graph on two edge colours, that is with two adjacency relations, is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ with probability 1.

It is useful to imagine the 'evolution' of a random structure as a set of n points develops a structure, which in the case of random graphs is the addition of edges at random; this is how P. Erdős and A. Rényi originally viewed random processes on large discrete structures. The main aim of random graph theory is to determine at what stage of this evolutionary process is the graph likely to develop a certain property. A way of establishing a formalism to study this precisely is to consider the property of a 'typical' graph in a probability space of graphs of a particular type. The simplest probability space consists of all graphs on n vertices, each of which is assigned the same probability, though there are many such *models* of random graphs [**55**, Chapter 2].

To highlight the evolutionary process, consider a *random graph process* [**55**, p. 42] on $V(\Gamma) = \{0, \dots, n\}$, or simply a *graph process*, which is a Markov chain $\tilde{G} = (\Gamma_t)_0^\infty$, whose states are graphs on $V(\Gamma)$. Beginning with the *empty graph* $\Gamma_0 = (V(\Gamma) = \varnothing, E(\Gamma) = \varnothing)$, form the graph Γ_t from Γ_{t-1} for $1 \le t \le \binom{n}{2}$ by the addition of an edge, all new edges being equiprobable. Then Γ_t has exactly t edges, and if $t = \binom{n}{2}$ then Γ_t is the complete graph on n vertices, and if $t > \binom{n}{2}$ then this is also adopted.

An alternative way of establishing the process of random edge-acquisition is to say that a graph process is a sequence $(\Gamma_t)_t^N = 0$ such that

(i) each Γ_t is a graph on $V(\Gamma)$,
(ii) Γ_t has t edges for $t = 0, 1, \dots, N$ and
(iii) $\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma_1 \subset \dots$.

If we give all members of the set $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ of all $N!$ graph processes the same probability, then we turn it into a probability space. The graph Γ_t is called the *state* of the process $\tilde{G} = (\Gamma_t)_0^N$ at time t.

There is a measure-preserving map between $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ and the set $\mathcal{G}_{M,n}$ of simple complete n-vertex M-edge graphs, in which the graphs have equal probability. This is defined by $\tilde{G} = (\Gamma_t)_0^N \to \Gamma_{M,n}$, so that we can identify the set of graphs obtained at time $t = M$ with $\mathcal{G}_{M,n}$, that is a random graph from $\mathcal{G}_{M,n}$ is the same as the state of a graph process $\tilde{G}$ at time M.

A *random bipartite graph process* has also been defined and studied [**55**, p. 171].

It should be mentioned that the graphs in the classical theory often have a high degree of symmetry and succumb to probabilistic, algebraic and analytic methods for dealing with the questions that arise. More recently, massive and complex real-world graphs have become popular and these have the opposite properties [**148**], including,

(i) sparsity, (the number of edges is at most a constant multiple of the number of vertices);
(ii) small world phenomena, (any two vertices are connected by a short path, and two vertices having a common neighbour are more likely to be neighbours);
(iii) power law degree distribution, (the number of vertices with degree n is proportional to $n^{-\beta}$ for a constant β.

A *space of random structures* is a sequence of probability spaces. A probability distribution can be attached to the class of n-element structures for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The point set of the structure can either be labeled or unlabeled and in the latter case the class is an isomorphism class.

If r_n denotes the proportion of graphs on n vertices having a graph-theoretic property $\mathcal{P}$ and if $\lim_{n\to\infty} r_n = 1$, then we say that *almost every graph has property* $\mathcal{P}$. The intuition of the probabilistic existence proof of the random graph given by Erdős and Rényi [**202**] is that for increasingly large structures taken from a space of random structures, the properties of interest will either almost always hold or almost never hold. This idea of a *zero-one law* goes back to Kolmogorov, and in a graph-theoretic context it says that either almost every finite graph with a certain property $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies the law or almost none does.

In order to make this idea more precise, the property $\mathcal{P}$ is taken to be monotone increasing, that is one for which a graph satisfies $\mathcal{P}$ whenever one of its subgraphs does. The probabilistic approach [**12**] is one of the most effective methods in combinatorics.

Let M_n be a random structure of size n over a first-order language L and define for any sentence σ of L,

$$Pr_n(\sigma) = Pr(M_n \vDash \sigma)$$

and if it exists

$$Pr(\sigma) = \lim_{n\to\infty} Pr_n(\sigma).$$

The zero-one law for the first-order theory of random graphs is due to Glebskii *et al.* [**245**] and Fagin [**209**] and can be stated as a corollary to the following theorem:

A.31. THEOREM. *Almost every finite graph satisfies a first-order property if and only if* $\mathfrak{R}$ *does.*

PROOF. Let σ be a first-order sentence in the language of graphs. Denote by Ψ_k the axiom resembling the k-e.c. property, with U and V both being sets of at most k vertices. A probabilistic argument similar to that given in Chapter 1 for three colours, shows that $\Pr(\Psi_k) = 1$ for each k. A graph Γ is e.c., that is satisfies (†), if $\Gamma \vDash \Psi_k$ for all k. We know that such a countable graph is unique up to isomorphism and is $\mathfrak{R}$. Therefore the Ψ_k are axioms for $\mathfrak{R}$, because $\mathfrak{R}$ is characterized by (∗). Take any sentence σ such that $\mathfrak{R} \vDash \sigma$. Then $\Psi_k \vdash \sigma$. So $\{\Psi_1, \ldots, \Psi_{k_0}\} \vdash \sigma$, where k_0 is finite. Then $\Pr(\sigma) = 1$.

Conversely, if $\mathfrak{R} \nvDash \sigma$, then $\mathfrak{R} \vDash \neg\sigma$, so $\Pr(\neg\sigma) = 1$, so $\Pr(\sigma) = 0$. □

A.32. COROLLARY. *If* σ *is a first-order sentence in the language of graphs, and random graphs are chosen uniformly, then* $Pr(\sigma)$ *exists and equals either* 0 *or* 1*.*

PROOF. From the theorem, $Pr(\sigma) = 1$ if and only if $\mathfrak{R} \vDash \sigma$.

If it is not the case that $\mathfrak{R} \vDash \sigma$ then $\mathfrak{R} \vDash \neg\sigma$ and so $Pr(\sigma) = 0$. □

A unique random countable structure in Fagin's proof does not always exists, but the proof applies to the uniform space of relational structures. Fagin's proof fails if the language has a function symbol; for example if c is a constant and W_i is a unary relation, then the sentence $c \in W_i$ has probability $\frac{1}{2}$. There are instances when the zero-one law fails but $\Pr(\sigma)$ exists for each first-order sentence σ.

More basic results on first-order theory of random graphs are due to Blass and Harary [**48**].

Cameron and Martins [**120**] have an application that relates oligomorphic automorphisms to first order sentences:

A.33. THEOREM (Cameron–Martins). *Given a finite collection of finite graphs, and the subsets of vertices of a random graph* Γ *(but not* Γ *itself) that induce those graphs, it is almost always possible to uniquely reconstruct a class of graphs equivalent to* Γ*.*

The uniqueness in the theorem is up to equivalence, referring to one of five natural equivalence relations/automorphisms on graphs given by Thomas' Theorem on the classification of the reducts of $\mathfrak{R}$.

The result is obtained by combining the above theorem of Fagin and the Engeler–Ryll-Nardzewski–Svenonius Theorem [**197**] [**468**] [**509**].

The theory of graphs together with the $(*)$-condition for every natural number has no finite models and all countable models are isomorphic, so the theory is complete [**536**] [**231**].

Whilst in our work the vertex-joining probabilities are always constant, an obvious generalization, which has generated a vast amount of mathematics, is assuming a variable edge probability. An important result [**502**] is that the probability $p_n(A)$ of a random graph having a *first-order property* A, almost never or almost surely holds, that is $\lim_{n\to\infty} p_n(A) = 0$ or 1. If $p(n)$ denotes the vertex-dependent connection probability then a *threshold function* $p_0(n)$ for A is such that if $p(n) \ll p_0(n)$ then A almost never holds and whenever $p(n) \gg p_0(n)$ then A holds almost surely. Of particular significance is the phenomenon of phase transitions, an example of which occurs in the emergence of giant components in a random graph as it grows in size when vertex pairs are joined independently with probability p. For example, denoting by $\Gamma(n,p)$ the random graph on n vertices with connection probability p, which is also a probability space, Erdős and Rényi discovered a global change in the nature of $\Gamma(n,p)$ near $p = 1/n$. When $p = (1-\epsilon)/n$ the components are all small (the largest having size $O(\ln n)$) and are all trees or unicyclic, but when $p = (1+\epsilon)/n$ a giant component with far more edges than vertices emerges. Benny Sudakov and Michael Krivelevich have given [**508**] a new simple, proof of the theorem about the threshold for a "giant component" of a random graph, using the *depth-first* technique used in computer science.

The book [**502**] discusses the work of J. Spencer and S. Shelah and its main result is that when $p = n^{-\alpha}$, if α is irrational then there is a zero-one law, but when α is any rational in $(0,1)$ then there is no such law. In fact for some first-order properties, there is an infinite number of threshold functions.

When the random graph has a uniform distribution, as has been assumed in this book, then the random graphs have very different properties to the case where random graphs have joining probability is of the form $p = n^{-\alpha}$, for irrational α. The differences are listed by Baldwin [**24**] In particular, the random graph with a uniform distribution is unstable (in fact, a prototypical theory with the independence property) and is $\aleph_0$-categorical, whereas the random graph with $p = n^{-\alpha}$, for irrational α is stable and is not $\aleph_0$-categorical.

J. Cohen [**150**] has written an account of the importance of threshold phenomena in random structures for explaining the physical theory of phase transitions, where sudden changes of phase result from gradual changes of a parameter like temperature. He speculates on possible applications of random combinatorial structures to telecommunications,

neurobiology and the origin of life. Thresholds are neither peculiar to a particular definition of randomness nor to graphs; rather they arise in a variety of random combinatorial structures in the limit of large size. See [**55**, p. 40] for more on threshold functions.

We must now note that the graphs we study in this monograph have uniform probability, that is constant and independent of n, and for these there are no threshold phenomena. Although there is no known general criterion that characterizes which spaces of random structures satisfy zero-one laws, Compton [**152**] has found that *uniform* spaces of random structures obey zero-one laws as long as the number of such structures does not grow too quickly.

Furthermore some "almost all" theorems cannot be easily obtained. For example, neither rigidity nor hamiltonicity can be deduced from any first-order property of almost all graphs [**48**], even though it is known that almost all graphs are rigid and hamiltonian.

Let $a(n) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$ be an exponential generating function where a_n is the number of labeled structures on an n-element set (see Appendix 12). Let $b(n) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n x^n$ be a generating function where b_n is the number of isomorphism classes of structures of size n. Compton calls a uniform space of random structures *slow-growing* if $a(x)$ (or $b(x)$) has a non-zero radius of convergence. Two of his results are

A.34. Theorem. *A slow-growing uniform labeled space of random structures closed under disjoint union and taking components has a zero-one law for first-order logic if and only if, for any m,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{a_{n-m}/(n-m)!}{a_n/n!} = \infty.$$

A.35. Theorem. *A slow-growing uniform unlabeled space of random structures closed under disjoint union and taking components has a zero-one law for first-order logic if and only if, for any m,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{b_{n-m}}{b_n} = 1.$$

Uniform graphs are fast-growing, but still have a zero-one law.

There have been many variations on the theme of random graphs. We survey an example of one such, studied in [**64**]. The *infinite random n-ordered graphs*, $R^{(n)}$, is defined as the limit of a certain chain of finite graphs. Let $R_0 \sim K_n$. For some $t \geq 0$, define a finite overgraph of R_0, by adding a new vertex x_S to each n-vertex subgraph S of $V(R_t)$, thus giving R_{t+1}. Then $R^{(n)} = (\cup_{t\in\mathbb{N}} V(R_t), \cup_{t\in\mathbb{N}} E(R_t)) = \lim_{t\to\infty} R_t$. For the

random graph $\mathfrak{R}$, simply add x_S to *every* subset S of $V(R_t)$, and not just those of cardinality at most n.

A graph is *strongly n-e.c.* if for every n-element subset U, and finite W of the vertex set $V(\Gamma)$ of the graph, there is a vertex $z \in V(\Gamma)\backslash(U \cup W)$ such that all edges between v and U are present and no edges between v and W are present. A strongly n-e.c. graph is infinite and strongly m-e.c. for all $m < n$.

A.36. THEOREM. *Fix a positive integer n.*

(1) *The graph $R^{(n)}$ is strongly n-e.c, but not $(n+1)$-e.c;*
(2) *If Γ is a strongly n-e.c. graph, then $R^{(n)}$ is an induced subgraph of Γ;*
(3) $R^{(n)} \leq R^{(n+1)}$;
(4) $\lim_{n\to\infty} R^{(n)} = \mathfrak{R}$;
(5) $\mathrm{Aut}(R^{(n)})$ *embeds all countable groups, including* $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$.

In a variation on this random graph process, new vertices have a higher probability of being added to older than younger vertices.

The notion of *graph limits* which was introduced by Borgs, Chayes, Lovász, Sós and Vesztergombi (see [**67**]) and further studied in [**364**] and [**171**] by B. Szegedy, P. Diaconis and S. Janson. The limits of sequences of (dense) graphs are not graphs, but rather symmetric measurable functions $W : [0,1]^2 \to [0,1]$ (the function W is *symmetric* if $W(x,y) = W(y,x)$). This limit object determines all the limits of subgraph densities and conversely each such function arises as a limit object. The notion is roughly that a growing sequence of finite graphs Γ_n converges if, for any fixed graph Γ, the proportion of copies of Γ in Γ_n converges. If γ is a fixed simple graph and $\mathrm{homo}(\gamma,\Gamma)$ denotes the number of homomorphisms of γ to Γ then the *homomorphism density* defined by

$$t(\gamma,\Gamma) = \frac{\mathrm{homo}(\gamma,\Gamma)}{|V(\Gamma)|^{|V(\gamma)|}}$$

is the probability that a random mapping $V(\gamma) \to V(\Gamma)$ is a homomorphism. Both $t(\cdot,\Gamma)$ and $\mathrm{homo}(\cdot,\Gamma)$ are multiplicative; a graph parameter f is *multiplicative* if $f(\Gamma_1 \sqcup \Gamma_2) = f(\Gamma_1)f(\Gamma_2)$ where $\Gamma_1 \sqcup \Gamma_2$ denotes the disjoint union of two graphs Γ_1 and Γ_2. Whilst the n-vertex random graphs converge with probability 1 uniquely up to automorphism, the limit object for random graphs of density p on n nodes is the constant function p, and the homomorphism densities have different limits depending on density. Every such W gives rise to a general

model of random graphs, called W-*random*, and every random graph model satisfying some natural criteria can be obtained in this way for an appropriate W.

By defining for a simple graph γ

$$t(\gamma, W) = \int_{[0,1]^{V(\gamma)}} \prod_{i,j \in E(\gamma)} W(x_i, x_j)\, dx,$$

the homomorphism density can be thought of as a "moment" of W. Borgs et al prove [**68**] that every bounded symmetric function W is determined by its moments up to a measure preserving transformation of the variables.

It was also discovered [**171**] that the characterization of Lovász et al of the graph limits is essentially equivalent to the characterization of *exchangeable random infinite graphs* by Aldous and Hoover. A random infinite graph in the set of all labeled countable graphs, is *exchangeable* if its distribution is invariant under every permutation of the vertices; it is sufficient here to consider only finite vertex permutations. Exchangeable random graphs converge to a limiting object which may be thought of as a probability measure on infinite random graphs. There is a 1–1 correspondence between infinite exchangeable random graphs and distributions on the space of proper graph limits.

Our work has focussed on the classical random graph and its derivatives, introduced by Erdős and A. Rényi [**202**]. These are homogeneous in the sense that all their vertices come in one type, and the vertex degrees tend to be concentrated around a typical value. Recently 'inhomogeneous' random graph models have been studied with a view to modeling real-world phenomena, for example in [**500**]. Others have power-law distributions. Amongst these are the inhomogeneous models of sparse graphs introduced [**56**] by Bollobás, Janson and Riordan which are closely related to the convergent sequences of dense graphs.

In the context of the above work on graph limits, Freedman, Lovász, and Schrijver, introduced the concept of a *graph algebra* [**221**].

Another structure that has arisen is the notion of *graphon* introduced by Lovász and Szegedy in [**364**]. Razborov [**456**] [**457**] has an alternative formulation in terms of the related concept of *flag algebras* [**456**]. A third equivalent formulation is Tao's notion of a permutation-invariant measure space [**512**] [**513**, p. 171], which takes a sequence of increasingly large but still dense graphs whose limiting object is a probability space $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ together with a $\mathrm{Sym}(\infty)$-action on $\mathbb{Z}$.

We summarize the work of David Aldous [**14**] and co-workers on exchangeability and continuum limits of discrete random structures.

For any kind of object, there is a *random* such object. An S-valued random variable X has a distribution $\mathrm{dist}(X)$, the induced probability measure on S. A probability measure on S^∞ is *exchangeable* if it is invariant under the action of each map $\tilde{\pi} : S^\infty \to S^\infty : (s_i) \mapsto (s_{\pi(i)})$, where π is a finite permutation of $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots\}$. A sequence of random variables obeys this strong symmetry condition of exchangeability if order is not important. Any countable mixture of independent indentically-defined (IID) sequences is exchangeable; de Finetti's theorem is the converse.

One way of examining a structure with a probability measure is to sample k IID random points (say graph vertices) and consider an induced k-element substructure relating the random points. Within the limit of random structures, the k-elements are exchangeable and the distributions are consistent as k increases, and so can be used to define an infinite structure. Thus, exchangeable representations of random structures provide a way to derive the $n \to \infty$ continuum limit of discrete random finite n-element structures.

Aldous goes on to show how the theory can be applied to continuum scale-invariant random spatial networks, and in particular how beginning with a square lattice it is possible to refine it so that it can be used to define (by continuity) routes between points in $\mathbb{R}^2$. External randomization gives the process further invariance properties.

Now that we have defined random graphs, we can discuss them in the context of ages and ubiquity.

Let $\mathcal{Y}(\mathfrak{R})$ be the set of all graphs on the vertex set $\mathbb{N}$. The Baire category version of the Erdős–Rényi statement that almost all countable graphs are isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$, is:

A.37. Theorem. *The set of graphs on* $\mathbb{N}$ *which are isomorphic to* $\mathfrak{R}$ *is residual in* $\mathcal{Y}(\mathfrak{R})$.

Proof. For given finite disjoint sets U and V, the set $\mathcal{S}(U, V)$ of graphs for which there exists z joined to every vertex in U and to none in V, is open and dense in $\mathcal{Y}(\mathfrak{R})$. The result will then follow, because a graph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ if and only if it lies in the intersection of all these sets.

$\mathcal{S}(U, V)$ *is open*: If S is a graph in this set, z is the witnessing vertex, and $m = \max(U \cup V \cup \{z\})$, then any graph agreeing with S on $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ is in $\mathcal{S}(U, V)$.

$\mathcal{S}(U, V)$ *is dense*: If we have a graph on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, where without loss of generality $\max(U \cup V) \leq n$, then we can join the next vertex $n+1$ correctly to U and not V, and guarantee membership in $\mathcal{S}(U, V)$. □

The principle behind this proof can be generalized. A sentence of first-order logic is called *inductive* if for a quantifier-free σ, it takes the form $(\forall x_1, \ldots, x_m)(\exists y_1, \ldots, y_n)\sigma$.

A.38. THEOREM. *Let M be a countable relational structure, and Σ a countable set of inductive sentences in the language of M. Then the set of models of Σ is residual in $\mathcal{Y}(M)$.*

PROOF. A countable intersection of residual sets is residual, so it suffices to prove this for a single sentence. Now follow the argument used above for the inductive sentence $\sigma_{m,n}$ in $\mathfrak{R}$. □

A.39. COROLLARY. *Let M be a countable relational structure. Then the set of structures S satisfying $Age(S) = Age(M)$ is residual in $\mathcal{Y}(M)$.*

This corollary states that almost all structures younger than M actually have the same age. It is proved by taking, for each finite structure X of M, the existential sentence saying that X occurs as a substructure.

A.40. COROLLARY. *If M is a countable homogeneous relational structure, then M is ubiquitous in category.*

Since almost all structures in $\mathcal{Y}(M)$ have the same age as M, we merely observe that M is characterized by the I-property, which can be expressed as a countable number of inductive sentences.

A relational structure M is *universal* if every structure which is younger than M is embeddable in M. If S is embeddable in M then S is younger than M, but the converse is false. For example, if M is a two-way infinite path then Age(M) consists of all disjoint unions of finite paths and $\mathcal{Y}(M)$ consists of all disjoint unions of finite or countable paths. The union of two two-way infinite paths is not embeddable in M. However the following holds [**91**]:

A.41. THEOREM. *If a countable relational structure is either homogeneous or $\aleph_0$-categorical then it is universal.*

One graph invariant that has drawn attention is the distinguishing number, introduced in [**8**].

The *distinguishing number* of a graph Γ is the smallest positive integer r such that Γ has a labeling of its vertices with r labels for which there is no non-trivial automorphism of Γ preserving these labels. Imrich, Klavžar and Trofimov [**301**] computed the distinguishing number of some infinite graphs, showing in particular that $\mathfrak{R}$ has distinguishing number 2. This result has been generalised by Laflamme

et al. [**347**], who show that the automorphism groups of many countable homogeneous relational structures have distinguishing number either 2 or ∞, including countable homogenous graphs (both directed and undirected), the universal poset, and the countable dense linear order $(\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$. Moreover, they show that any countable homogeneous structure satisfying the *Free Amalgamation Property* (see Appendix refTheoryofRelationalStructures) has distinguishing number 2. Bonato and Delić [**62**] further showed that any countable relational structure satisfying a particular adjacency property (which they call the *weak-e.c.property*) has distinguishing number 2. More on this topic can be found in the paper by Robert Bailey and Peter Cameron [**22**].

The subject of random graphs has been an exciting research area for over half a century, and it would require an enormous treatise to cover the variations on the theme together with applications.

We end the section with some comments on the automorphism group of the random graph, reserving most of the discussion for the main text. This group embeds all finite or countable groups. All its cycle structures of were classified by Truss [**531**]. The following two theorems [**42**] [**43**] of Bhattacharjee and Macpherson demonstrate remarkable properties of subgroups of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$.

A.42. THEOREM. *There exist $g_1, g_2 \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ such that*

(a) *g_1 has a single cycle on $\mathfrak{R}$ which is infinite;*
(b) *g_2 fixes a vertex v and has two cycles on the remaining vertices (namely, the neighbours and non-neighbours of v);*
(c) *the group $\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle$ is free and is transitive on vertices, edges, and non-edges of $\mathfrak{R}$, and each of its non-identity elements has only finitely many cycles on $\mathfrak{R}$.*

This theorem is proved by building the permutations g_1 and g_2 as limits of partial maps constructed in stages. Parts (a) and (b) follow from Truss' classification of cycle types, about which more will be said in the main text. To prove (c) requires a lot of work.

A.43. THEOREM. *There is a locally finite group G of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ which acts homogeneously (that is, any isomorphism betwen finite subgraphs can be extended to an element of G).*

This theorem uses a result of Hrushovski [**292**] on extending partial automorphisms of graphs.

We have had a fair bit to say about the concept of switching of graphs, and we end this section with an application of the classical theory of Seidel switching.

There is a problem in extremal graph theory linked to a problem in classical geometry through the work of Gromov. I. Bárány showed [**28**] that, for any dimension d, there is a constant c_d such that, given any finite set of points in general position in d-dimensional Euclidean space, there is a point (not necessarily in the set) which is contained in a proportion at least c_d of all the d-simplices spanned by the given points. The problem is to calculate the value of c_d, which is known to be $2/9$ for $d = 2$, but little more is known.

Gromov introduced a topological method, which depended on a function f_d. The definition for $d = 2$ which we give presently, easily generalizes and depends on Seidel switching of graphs. A graph is called *Seidel-minimal* if it has the smallest number of edges of any graph in its Seidel switching class (equivalently, given any cut, there are at least as many non-edges as edges crossing it). Any graph has a two-graph, or coboundary, which is an invariant of the switching class. Now $f_2(\alpha)$ is defined to be the limit inferior of the density of the coboundary of a Seidel-minimal graph of density at least α, where here density means the proportion of edges or triples out of the total possible. Gromov gave a lower bound for c_d depending on the functions f_e for all $e \leq d$. So better bounds on f_2 could improve lower bounds for c_d for all $d > 2$.

This is exactly what Bárány and L. Mach have done, using flag algebra computations. They have improved the lower bound for c_3 from 0.06332 to 0.07509. (The best upper bound is 0.09375.) See [**340**] for references including the work of Gromov.

Bodirsky and Pinsker have produced a detailed study [**51**] of what they call *minimal functions* on the random graph, proving using a Ramsey-type theorem, that there is a system of 14 non-trivial finitary functions on the random graph such that any nontrivial function on the random graph generates one of the functions of this system by composition with automorphisms and by topological closure, and that the system is minimal in the sense that no subset of the system has the same property.

They derive Thomas' Theorem on reduct classification and prove some refinements of this theorem. They also classify the minimal reducts closed under *primitive positive* definitions, and prove that all reducts of the random graph and of the linear order of the rationals $(\mathbb{Q}; <)$ are model-complete. A structure is model-complete if and only if its first-order theory is model-complete.

The substantial treatise by Bollobás [**55**] deals with the combinatorial theory of random graphs, and the book by Spencer [**502**] is an account of the interplay of logic, probability theory and random graphs. The article by Winkler [**558**] has more on the relationship between random structures and zero-one laws including those in higher logics than first-order. The article by Baldwin [**24**] summarizes the use of logic for studying limit laws on finite probability spaces, and shows how Urysohn space arises as the limit of finite spaces with probability measures as compared with Vershik's construction in which measures lie on infinite sets.

10. Topology in Permutation Groups

To a metric space (X, d) is associated a *natural topology* $T_d(X)$ in which a set $O \subset X$ is called *open* if and only if for every $x \in O$ there is a real number $r > 0$ such that

$$B(x, r) := \{y \in X : d(y, x) < r\} \subset O,$$

where $B(x, r)$ is the *open ball* of radius r centred at x. So the *topological space* $(X, T_d(X))$ is associated with the metric space (X, d).

The natural topology on permutation groups is the *topology of pointwise convergence* in which for a sequence g_n of permutations on X, $\lim_{n\to\infty}(g_n) = g$ if and only if $\forall x_i \in X$, $\exists n_0 \in \omega$ such that $\forall n > n_0$, $x_i g_n = x_i g$. At the heart of the topology of pointwise convergence is the idea that permutations agree on points that are close to each other. The space of zero-one sequences is a complete metric space and its topology is that of pointwise convergence.

Endowing a group G with this topology turns it into a *topological group*, that is multiplication and inversion are continuous, so that if $g_n \to g$ and $h_n \to h$ then $g_n h_n \to gh$ and $g_n^{-1} \to g^{-1}$.

A basis of open sets in this topology consists of the cosets of pointwise stabilizers of finite tuples; the subgroups involved are called *basic open subgroups*. The topology can be derived from a metric. The distance function defined by:

$$d(g, h) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g = h; \\ \frac{1}{2^i} & \text{if } jg = jh \text{ and } jg^{-1} = jh^{-1} \text{ for all } j < i, \\ & \text{but } ig \neq ih \text{ and } ig^{-1} \neq ih^{-1}, \end{cases}$$

turns $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$ into a complete metric space.

The *closure* of a permutation group is the set of all permutations which are limits of sequences of group elements. The closure

of $G < \mathrm{Sym}(X)$ acting on Ω is the largest group having the same orbits on Ω^n as G for all n. An *automorphism* of a first-order structure M is a permutation g that preserves all relations, fixes constants and commutes with functions by $f(x_1g, \ldots, x_ng) = f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)g$. Denote the group of such automorphisms by $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$. The topologies defined on $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$ are the same as that defined on automorphism groups.

A space admitting a countable dense set is called *separable*. If M is a countably infinite first-order structure and $G = \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ then either

$|G| \leq \aleph_0$,

or

$|G| = 2^{\aleph_0}$, the first alternative holding if and only if the stabilizer of some tuple is the identity. Because M is countable this topology is metrizable (via the above distance function), and G is a complete separable metric space.

In the latter case where $|G| = 2^{\aleph_0}$, the identity and hence every point is a limit point. In the first case, $|G|$ is equal to the number of tuples in its orbit, so is at most countable and the induced topology on G is *discrete*, that is every subset is open; it follows that every subset is also closed. Taking the discrete topology on a set X means that a sequence of elements of X converges if and only if its limit is constant.

Closed subgroups of the symmetric group have tamer properties than arbitrary subgroups. Evans has proved [**205**] that if G and H are closed subgroups of $\mathrm{Sym}(X)$, and $H \leq G$, then either $|G : H| \leq \aleph_0$ or $|G : H| = 2^{\aleph_0}$, and the former holds if and only if H contains the stabilizer in G of some tuple. The following result is proved in [**103**]:

A.44. Theorem. *Let G be a permutation group acting on a countable set Ω. The following are equivalent:*

(a) *G is a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$;*
(b) *$G = \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ for some first-order structure M on Ω;*
(c) *$G = \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ for some relational structure M on Ω.*

The following [**97**] lists some of the topological properties of subgroups.

A.45. Theorem. *Let $G < \mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{N})$. Then,*

(a) *G is open if and only if it contains the pointwise stabilizer of a finite set;*
(b) *G is closed if and only if it is the automorphism group of some first-order structure on $\mathbb{N}$;*
(c) *G is discrete if and only if the pointwise stabilizer of some finite set is trivial;*

(d) *G is compact if and only if it is closed and all its orbits are finite;*
(e) *G is locally compact if and only if it is closed and all orbits of the stabilizer of some finite set are finite.*

Another characterisation of a topological group is [**325**]

A.46. THEOREM. *Let G be a topological group. Then $G = \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ for some countable structure M if and only if*

(a) *G is Hausdorff;*
(b) *G is complete;*
(c) *if $H < G$ is open then $|G : H| \leq \aleph_0$;*
(d) *there is a countable family $\{H_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of subgroups of G such that $\mathcal{B} = \{H_0^{g_0} \cap \ldots \cap H_k^{g_k} : k \in \mathbb{N}, g_0, \ldots, g_k \in G\}$ is a base of open subgroups of G, i.e. the set of cosets of elements of $\mathcal{B}$ forms a base for the topology on G.*

The topology defined at the beginning of this section varies according to the precise basic open subgroups chosen. It is always Hausdorff (so any Cauchy sequence converges to at most one point) but not in general compact. If the automorphism group of a structure is oligomorphic then the topology is not locally compact.

Bergman and Shelah [**41**] have classified the closed subgroups of the countably infinite symmetric group $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$, as follows:

A.47. THEOREM. *For $G_1, G_2 \leq \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ write $G_1 \approx G_2$ if there exists a finite set $U \subseteq \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ such that $\langle G_1 \cup U \rangle = \langle G_2 \cup U \rangle$. The subgroups closed in the function topology on $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ lie in one of four equivalence classes under this relation, depending on which of the following statements about pointwise stabilizer subgroups $G_{(S)}$ of finite subsets $S \subseteq \Omega$ holds:*

(i) *For every finite set S, the subgroup $G_{(S)}$ has at least one infinite orbit in Ω;*
(ii) *There exist finite sets S such that all orbits of $G_{(S)}$ are finite, but none such that the cardinalities of these orbits have a common finite bound.*
(iii) *There exist finite sets S such that the cardinalities of the orbits of $G_{(S)}$ have a common finite bound, but none such that $G_{(S)} = \{1\}$.*
(iv) *There exist finite sets S such that $G_{(S)} = \{1\}$.*

Note that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ satisfies case (i); in fact, for any finite set S all the orbits of $G_{(S)}$ outside S are infinite, and have the property that the induced subgraph is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}$ and $G_{(S)}$ acts homogeneously on

it. (If $|W| = n$, then the pointwise stabilizer of W has 2^n orbits outside W: for each subset $U \subset W$, there is an orbit consisting of the points witnessing condition $(*)$ for $(U, W\backslash U)$). So [**376**, Theorem 1.1] there is a finite set B such that $\langle \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}), B\rangle = \mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{R})$. From [**232**], B can be a single element.

We now turn to reconstruction problems in model theory: what can we know about a saturated structure M or its theory $\mathrm{Th}(M)$ from its automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$? As the next theorem [**283**] indicates, we can pin down the theory up to *bi-interpretability*, a concept which we now define.

A *permutation structure* is a pair $\langle W; \mathrm{Aut}(W)\rangle$ where W is a non-empty set [**206**]. Two such structures are *bi-interpretable* if their automorphism groups are isomorphic as topological groups. Two countable totally categorical structures M and N are called *bi-interpretable*, that is they have $\mathrm{Aut}(M) \cong \mathrm{Aut}(N)$ as topological groups if and only if there are interpretations ι_1 of M in N and ι_2 of N in M, both without parameters, such that the natural isomorphisms $M \cong \iota_1\iota_2(M)$ and $N \cong \iota_2\iota_1(M)$ are definable without parameters in M and N respectively.

A.48. Theorem. *If T and T' are $\aleph_0$-categorical theories and M and N are their countable models then the following are equivalent:*

(a) *there is a bicontinuous isomorphism from* $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ *to* $\mathrm{Aut}(N)$*;*
(b) *T and T' are bi-interpretable.*

Therefore $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ as a topological group tells us everything about T. Let M and N be relational structures. If M and N are saturated models of the same theory T, then it is possible to reconstruct $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(N)$ as topological groups from each other. It is possible to reconstruct [**350**] the category of all models of a countably saturated model M from the topological group $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$, with elementary maps as morphisms. (A map between two L-structures M and N is *elementary* if, for any tuple $\overline{a}$ in M and formula $\phi(\overline{x})$ of L, if $\phi(\overline{a})$ holds in M, then $\phi(\overline{a}f)$ holds in N).

A topological group is the automorphism group of a first-order structure if it satisfies the criteria of Theorem A.46. It is possible to reconstruct an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure from its automorphism group as a permutation group. From the work of D. Evans and P. Hewitt [**207**] it is not possible to reconstruct an $\aleph_0$-categorical theory from its pure automorphism group; they exhibited two $\aleph_0$-categorical structures whose automorphism groups are isomorphic as abstract groups but not as topological groups.

Classifying totally categorical structures up to their abstract automorphism group is the same as classifying them up to their topological automorphism group, because the topology may be obtained completely from an abstract group. This follows from the fact that such structures have the *small index property*, because the topology on $\mathrm{Aut}(N)$ can be recovered from $\mathrm{Aut}(N)$ as an abstract group [**284**]. Before we give a brief introduction to this property, we mention another approach to reconstruction of various structures, which is that of M. Rubin [**466**]. He found a condition related to the definability, in $\mathrm{Aut}(N)$, of point stabilizers, which implies that $\mathrm{Aut}(N)$ determines N up to bi-interpretability, or in some instances, up to bi-definability; such a structure is said to have a *weak* $\forall\exists$ *interpretation*. Slightly weaker versions of these interpretations for a range of relational structures are known.

A topological group G, or structure M where $G = \mathrm{Aut}(M)$, is said to have the *small index property* (SIP) if for all subgroups $H < G$, H is open if and only if $|G : H| \leq \aleph_0$.

For an infinite group G and an n-tuple $\bar{\mu} := (1, \ldots, n)$, write $\bar{\mu}g$ for $(1g, \ldots, ng)$ and $G_{\bar{\mu}} := \{g \in G : \bar{\mu}g = \bar{\mu}\}$. The group G is a topological group with its basic open sets being the cosets of the $G_{\bar{\mu}}$, for all n and $\bar{\mu}$. Left and right cosets are equivalent here, for $G_{\bar{\mu}g} = g^{-1}G_{\bar{\mu}}g$.

A subset of a topological space is *dense* if it meets every nonempty open set. A *Polish space* is a topological space that is separable and completely metrizable, meaning that its topology is induced by a complete metric. A topological group is *Polish* if the underlying topology of the group is that of a Polish space, with the open subgroups forming a base of open neighbourhoods of 1. For each $\bar{\mu}$, there is a bijection between the right cosets of $G_{\bar{\mu}}$ in G and the set $\{\bar{\mu}g : g \in G\}$. So $G_{\bar{\mu}}$ has small index in G, and so therefore does any open subgroup of G. For a topological group each of whose subgroups have SIP, the open subgroups are identifiable by their index alone, and then the open sets are unions of cosets of open subgroups. So the topology is determined by the group structure.

Suppose G_1 and G_2 are Polish groups, G_1 has the small index property and $\phi : G_1 \to G_2$. If ϕ is a homomorphism of abstract groups then it is continuous; if ϕ is an isomorphism of abstract groups then it is a homeomorphism and G_2 also has the small index property.

Cherlin and Hrushovski discovered that there are structures that fail the SIP [**325**] [**350**]. Examples of such groups are any meagre subgroup (that is one with comeagre complement) of a Polish group [**287**], or any of its cosets, all of which have index 2^ω in the overgroup. In [**103**, p. 108]

another structure is given, consisting of an interchangeable complementary pair of k-uniform hypergraphs (each hyperedge being a k-vertex subset) which has an automorphism group with quotient $\mathbb{Z}_2^\omega$.

Countable totally categorical structures necessarily have the SIP (see [**325**, p. 115].) A consequence of failure of SIP is that there will exist two models of the relevant structure whose automorphism groups are isomorphic as abstract groups but not as topological groups, so the two models fail to be bi-interpretable.

W. Hodges *et al.* [**287**] proved that the countable random graph has the SIP, and Cameron proved [**113**] that it also has the *strong small index property* meaning that any subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ with index less than $2^{\aleph_0}$ lies between the pointwise and setwise stabilizers of some finite tuple.

Gartside and Knight and define [**233**] a Polish group G to be *almost free* if a residual subset of the n-tuples of elements of G freely generate a free group. They give a number of equivalent characterisations of such groups, and show:

A.49. Theorem. *Closed oligomorphic groups are almost free.*

Another concept used in the study of automorphism groups is relevant, and was researched by Truss. If M is a countable saturated structure then $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ is *generic* if the conjugacy class of g is comeager in $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$, in the pointwise convergence topology. The random graph as well as many other structures admit such automorphisms [**531**] [**292**], and this has been useful in proving the small index property for them, see for example [**287**]. Generic sequences of automorphisms are finite sequences $(g_1, \ldots, g_n)$ for which the set $\{(\alpha g_1 \alpha^{-1}, \ldots, \alpha g_n \alpha^{-1}) : \alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(M)\}$ is comeager on a nonempty open subset of the product of n copies of $\mathrm{Aut}(M)$. For such sequences to exist for all n, firstly automorphisms must amalgamate, and secondly if $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ are finite partial elementary maps from finite subsets of M onto finite subsets of M, then there exists a finite $A \subset M$ containing all the domains and ranges of the f_i's and elementary permutations $g_1, \ldots, g_n$ of A which extend the f_i's.

The generic elements of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ have cycle type $\prod_{1 \le k < \infty} k^\infty$, reflecting that no finite amount of information about g can prevent x from lying in a finite-length cycle, and so g has no infinite cycles. For a structure M, the necessary condition for generic elements to exist in $G = \mathrm{Aut}(M)$ is that an appropriate cofinal subset of the natural family of finite approximations to $g \in G$ satisfies the relevant amalgamation and joint embedding properties. For $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ this cofinal subset may be

taken to be the set of p for which $\mathrm{dom}(p) = \mathrm{range}(p)$. Macpherson gave the following example. Let $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$, $\alpha \in \mathrm{Sym}(m)$ and function F be such that $F\{xg, yg\} = (F\{x, y\})\alpha$ for all $x \neq y$ in $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$. If m is finite then each conjugacy class of the full symmetry group $\mathrm{Sym}(m)$ has a corresponding generic automorphism, whilst if m is infinite there will be a generic automorphism. Generic automorphisms of the random (countable, universal, homegeneous) tournament are also known. The group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ however is torsion-free and therefore no element of this group can have finite cycles of length greater than 1, and so in this case the generic elements look different. A condition for genericity of automorphisms of the m-coloured version of the rationals in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ is known, and refinements of the concept of genericity were examined by Truss. An example of a non-closed permutation group having generic members is the point-stabilizer $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q})_x$.

A notion of genericity for endomorphisms of homogeneous structures has been defined and studied [**363**].

The notion of Baire category works better than measure here, for while there are a countable set of finite approximations, it is unclear how measures should be applied.

In [**327**], Kechris and Rosendal extend the concept of generics that Hodges et al. [**287**] employ for automorphism groups to more general Polish groups. A Polish group has *ample generic* elements if for all finite n there exists a comeagre orbit for the (diagonal) conjugacy action of G on $G^n : g \cdot (g_1, \ldots, g_n) = (gg_1g^{-1}, \ldots, gg_ng^{-1})$. This is clearly a stronger condition than just having a comeagre conjugacy class; for example $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ has the latter but not the former. The *cofinality* of a group G is the least cardinality of a well-ordered chain of proper subgroups whose union is G. Again generalizing results of [**287**] they show

A.50. Theorem. *A Polish group with ample generic elements is not the union of countably many non-open subgroups (or even cosets of subgroups).*

If G, a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$, is oligomorphic, then by a result of Cameron, any open subgroup of G is contained in only finitely many subgroups of G, so if G has ample generics then it has uncountable cofinality.

That $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ has ample generics has continuity consequences. For example any unitary representation of $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ on separable Hilbert space acts by homeomorphisms on some locally compact Polish space or by isometries on some Polish metric space, then it does so continuously.

A.51. Theorem. [**327**] $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ *has precisely two separable group topologies, namely the trivial one and the usual Polish topology.*

The following theorem [**379**] connects the existence of a comeagre conjugacy class in a Polish group and actions of the group on trees.

A.52. THEOREM (Macpherson–Thomas). *Let G be a Polish group with a comeagre conjugacy class. Then G cannot be written as a free product with amalgamation.*

It is also true that [**327**] every element of such a group G is a commutator and that it does not have $\mathbb{Z}$ as a homomorphic image.

We can also ask what group is generated by a 'typical' n-tuple of elements. Dixon proved that almost all pairs of elements of the finite symmetric group $Sym(n)$ generate $Sym(n)$ or the alternating group $Alt(n)$, later [**176**] proving an analogue for the symmetric group of countable degree: almost all pairs of elements (in the sense of Baire category, that is, a residual set) generate a highly transitive free subgroup. (The existence of highly transitive free groups was first shown by McDonough). These results have been extended to wider classes of groups.

Our final topic is that of large subgroups of infinite symmetric groups [**375**] [**111**], of which subgroups of small index is a part, and in particular proper *maximal subgroups*. A subgroup of a group G is maximal in G if and only if the action of G by right multiplication on the right cosets of the subgroup is primitive. So maximal subgroups and primitive group actions are essentially the same thing. The maximal subgroups of the symmetric group were classified in [**359**]. We can only indicate a few of the highlights in this subject. The operand $|\Omega|$ is not restricted to being countable.

If H is a maximal subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ and $\aleph_0 \le \alpha \le |\Omega|$ then either $\mathrm{BSym}_\alpha(\Omega) \le H$, in which case H is highly transitive; or $\mathrm{BSym}_\alpha(\Omega)H = \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$, in which case for some $\Delta \subset \Omega$ with $|\Delta| < \alpha$, $\mathrm{Sym}_{\{\Delta\}}$ induces $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega\backslash\Delta)$ [**376**].

A *filter* $\mathcal{F}$ on a set Ω is a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ containing $\Omega\backslash\varnothing$, which is closed upwards and under finite intersections. By replacing every set in the filter with its complement, we get an *ideal* on Ω, which is a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ containing $\varnothing\backslash\Omega$, and is closed downwards and under finite unions. An *ultrafilter* is a filter which is maximal with respect to inclusion, and a *principal ultrafilter* is one that has a least element. Two ultrafilters are *equivalent* if a permutation of Ω maps one to the other. Two ultrafilters are *uniform* if all its elements have the same cardinality. If $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ and $G \le \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ then we can define $G_S := \{g \in G : \forall s \in S \Leftrightarrow sg \in S\}$. Also $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)_{(\mathcal{F})} := \{g \in \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega) : \mathrm{fix}(g) \in \mathcal{F}\}$,

from which it is immediate that $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)_{(\mathcal{F})} \trianglelefteq \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)_{\{\mathcal{F}\}}$. The next theorem is in [**175**],

A.53. THEOREM (Dixon, Neumann and Thomas). *Suppose* $G \leq \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ *and* $|\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega) : G| < 2^{\kappa}$. *Let*

$$\mathcal{F} := \{\Gamma \subseteq \Omega : \exists \Delta \subseteq \Gamma \text{ with } |\Omega \backslash \Delta| = \kappa \text{ and } \mathrm{Sym}_{(\Delta)} \leq G\}.$$

Then

(1) $\mathcal{F}$ *is a filter on* Ω *and contains a moiety of* Ω*;*
(2) $\mathrm{Sym}_{(\mathcal{F})} \leq G \leq \mathrm{Sym}_{\{\mathcal{F}\}}$.

A structural similarity between $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)_{\{\mathcal{F}\}}$ and $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ is suggested by the next result [**375**],

A.54. THEOREM. *Let* $\mathcal{F}$ *be a uniform ultrafilter* $\mathcal{F}$ *on* Ω*, and* $|\Omega| = \kappa$. *Then* $\mathrm{BSym}_{\kappa}(\Omega) \trianglelefteq \mathrm{Sym}_{\{\mathcal{F}\}}$, *and* $\mathrm{Sym}_{\{\mathcal{F}\}} / \mathrm{BSym}_{\kappa}(\Omega)$ *is simple.*

Richman and Ball provided the first results on maximal subgroups of infinite symmetric groups. Among the results proved by Richman [**460**] are

(a) For an ultrafilter $\mathcal{F}$ on Ω, $\mathrm{Sym}_{(\mathcal{F})} = \mathrm{Sym}_{\{\mathcal{F}\}}$ and is maximal in $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$;
(b) $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ is highly transitive on the right cosets of $\mathrm{Sym}_{\{\mathcal{F}\}}$;
(c) the setwise stabilizer of a finite set of equivalent ultrafilters is maximal in $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ (including simply the setwise stabilizer of a finite set);
(d) the almost stabilizer of a partition into a finite number of equicardinal sets is maximal in $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ (a partition π is *almost stabilized* by g if, for all $A \in \pi$, there exists $B \in \pi$ such that the symmetric difference of Ag and B is finite).

Ball showed [**27**] that for an infinite set Ω, the setwise stabilizer of a finite set is a maximal subgroup in $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$, and that any transitive maximal subgroup contains the finitary symmetric group.

If $H < \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ is not highly transitive, then it is contained in a maximal subgroup [**377**]. If $H < \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ is such that $\langle H, B\rangle = \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ for some B with $|B| \leq |\Omega|$, then $\exists g$ such that $\langle H, g\rangle = \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$ [**232**].

Another topic studied within this group is *maximal closed groups* that is groups $G < \mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ such that G is closed as a permutation group and $\mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ has no proper closed subgroup properly containing G. Known examples of these groups suggest that this concept is the right analogue of maximal subgroups of finite symmetric groups. In order to classify these groups, it is natural to reduce them to primitive versions, but whereas the O'Nan–Scott Theorem requires the existence

of a socle, these G may not have them. What is adopted instead is the idea of a *minimal closed normal subgroup*; any automorphism group of an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure M possesses one, and they act on M either regularly or oligomorphically or neither.

In a different direction, we mention a result dealing with closed groups on $\mathfrak{R}$. In [**380**], Macpherson and Woodrow consider closed permutation groups G on a countably infinite set X and study the permutation groups (setwise stabilizers) $(G_{\{A\}}; A)$ induced on moieties $A \subset X$; here the assumption that G is closed on X can be characterized by the property that G is the full automorphism group of some first order structure on X. The group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ is shown to have interesting universality properties with respect to such subsets. For instance, they showed that if (H, B) is any closed permutation group of countable degree, then there is a moiety A of the vertex set of $\mathfrak{R}$ such that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})_{(A)} = 1$ and the permutation groups (H, B) and $(\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})_{\{A\}}, A)$.

Original sources of results on maximal subgroups of infinite symmetric groups include [**72**] [**161**] [**376**] [**377**] [**460**]

We refer the reader to [**90**] [**97**] [**111**] [**325**] [**375**] and references therein for more on the general topic of topology in permutation groups and proofs of some of the assertions.

11. Polynomials

Graded Algebras.

Let G be an infinite permutation group acting on an infinite set Ω. Cameron discovered [**78**] [**81**] an algebra $\mathcal{A}$ called the *age algebra* which encodes information about the action of G on finite subsets of Ω. Let K be a field of characteristic 0, for example $\mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. Define a K-vector space of functions from n-element subsets $\binom{\Omega}{n}$ of Ω to K which are invariant under the natural action of G on n-subsets. Let V_n be the nth homogeneous component, which is the space of functions from $\binom{\Omega}{n}$ to K, with pointwise addition.

Define $\mathcal{A} := \oplus_{n\geq 0} V_n$, where V_n is the space of G-fixed points, and multiplication for $f \in V_m, g \in V_n$ by

$$(f \cdot g)(X) = \sum_{Y \subseteq X} f(Y) \cdot g(X \setminus Y)$$

for $|Y| = m, |X| = n + m$ and this defines $fg \in V_{m+n}$. If $\mathcal{A}^G := \oplus_{n\geq 0} V_n^G$ is the algebra of $\mathcal{A}$-fixed points then $\dim(V_n^G) = f_n$ if this number is finite.

By extending this multiplication linearly to the whole domain we get an $\mathbb{N}$-graded, commutative, associative algebra $\mathcal{A}$, where f and g can be interpreted as the coefficients in the Hilbert series of the graded algebra. It has as identity the function in V_0 with value 1, and as non-zero-divisor the function $e : V_1 \to 1$. Furthermore, all functions with finite supports are nilpotent and so zero-divisors, because $f^n = 0$ if the support of f fails to have n disjoint sets. The age algebra of a relational structure is graded and connected, and so is finitely generated if and only if it is a Noetherian ring [**17**].

The structure of $\mathcal{A}^G$ is known in certain cases:

(1) If G is highly homogeneous (e.g. $G = \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$), then $\mathcal{A}^G$ is the polynomial algebra in one generator e, the constant function with value 1 in V_1.
(2) If $G = G_1 \times G_2$ in its intransitive action, then $\mathcal{A}^G = \mathcal{A}^{G_1} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{A}^{G_2}$. So for $G = \mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)^n$ in the intransitive action, $\mathcal{A}^G$ is a polynomial ring in n generators of degree 1.
(3) If $G = \mathrm{Aut}(M)$, where M is the Fraïssé limit of the class $\mathcal{C}$ of all finite simple graphs, that is $M = \mathfrak{R}$, then the generators of the polynomial algebra $\mathcal{A}^G$ correspond to connected graphs. This example can be generalized [**101**] to other structures.

If $\mathcal{A}^G$ is a polynomial algebra with a_n homogeneous generators of degree n for each n, then the sequences (f_n) and (a_n) are related by

$$\sum_{n\geq 0} f_n x^n = \prod_{k\geq 1} (1 - x^k)^{-a_k}.$$

These sequences have combinatorial interpretations independently of whether or not it is known that $\mathcal{A}^G$ is a polynomial algebra. For example, if G is the group of switching automorphisms of the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$ (see main text), then f_n is the number of n-vertex *even graphs* (graphs with all vertex degrees even) so a_n is the number of n-vertex *Eulerian graphs* (connected even graphs) [**79**] [**381**]. Given that $\mathcal{A}^G \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})}$, and that $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})}$ is a polynomial ring, then $\mathcal{A}^G$ is an integral domain, but it is an open question as to whether or not it is a polynomial ring.

A more detailed account of the above theory can be found in [**105**]. Julian Gilbey has explored what happens when G has no finite orbits [**238**]. He shows that if the permutation group in the Cameron's algebra has no finite orbits, then no homogeneous element of degree one is a zero-divisor of the algebra. He conjectures that the algebra is an integral domain if, in addition, the group is oligomorphic, proving

special cases in the form of wreath products and showing that the algebras corresponding to oligomorphic groups are polynomial algebras.

It was conjectured that if G has no finite orbits then $\mathcal{A}^G$ is an integral domain, this has recently been proved by M. Pouzet [**440**]. using the following approach. The *kernel* of a relational structure $\mathcal{M}$ is the subset $\ker(\mathcal{M})$ of $x \in \Omega$ ($|\Omega| = \infty$) such that $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_{|\Omega\setminus\{x\}}) \neq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$. If $\ker(\mathcal{M}) \neq \varnothing$, pick $x \in \ker(\mathcal{M})$ and $S \in \Omega^{<\omega}$ such that $\mathcal{M}_{|S} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})\setminus\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M}_{|\Omega\setminus\{x\}})$. Let $T \in \Omega^{<\omega}$. Set $f(T) := 1$ if $\mathcal{M}_{|T}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}_{|S}$, and 0 otherwise. Then $f^2 := f \cdot f = 0$.

A.55. Theorem (Pouzet). *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a relational structure with possibly infinitely many non-isomorphic types of n-element substructures. The age algebra $\mathbb{C}\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$ is an integral domain if and only if* $\ker(\mathcal{M}) = \varnothing$.

Thus in the G-action on Ω encoded by $\mathcal{M}$, $\ker(\mathcal{M})$ is the union of the finite G-orbits of the one-element sets. So if G has no finite orbit, $\ker(\mathcal{M}) = \varnothing$. Therefore $\mathcal{A}^G$ is an integral domain. If $\mathcal{A}^G$ is an integral domain then this property is preserved by passing to overgroups or transitive extensions.

The kernel of a relational structure $\mathcal{M}$ is empty if and only if for every finite subset $S \subset \Omega$ there is a disjoint subset T such that the restrictions $\mathcal{M}_{|S}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{|T}$ are isomorphic. The ages of such relational structures have the *disjoint embedding property* meaning that two arbitrary members of the age can be embedded into a third in such a way that their domain are disjoint. Ages with the disjoint embedding property are called *inexhaustible* and relational structures whose age is inexhaustible are called age-inexhaustible. Finally relational structures with finite kernel are *almost age-inexhaustible*. If G is oligomorphic then the kernel of the relational structure is finite.

A.56. Lemma. [**439**] *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an infinite inexhaustible age. Then:*

(i) For every age $\mathcal{A}'$ included into $\mathcal{A}$ there is an infinite strictly increasing sequence of ages included into $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A}_0 \subset \ldots \subset \mathcal{A}_n \subset \ldots$

(ii) The height of $\mathcal{A}$, is a limit ordinal, provided that it is defined.

A relation is *quasi-inexhaustible* if its kernel is finite. Two relations with the same age have isomorphic kernels, so we say that the age $\mathcal{A}$ is *quasi-inexhaustible* if it is the age of a quasi-inexhaustible relation. If the kernel is empty then quasi-inexhaustible reduces to inexhaustible. R. Fraïssé showed that ages are nonempty ideals of the poset of finite relational structures, considered up to isomorphism and ordered up by embeddability. In [**442**], Pouzet and Sobrani study the poset of ages

that lie in between two given ages, proving among other things that if this poset is infinite then it contains an infinite chain.

The concept of fixed points of an algebra leads on to the topic of polynomial invariants.

Polynomial Invariants.

We recall the basic idea of polynomial invariants of finite groups [**497**] [**37**] [**504**].

A polynomial $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ in the polynomial algebra $K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ in n variables over field K, is called *symmetric* if for $\pi \in Sym(n)$, $f(x_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\pi(n)}) = f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. Let $K[V]$ be a finite dimensional K-vector space on which a finite group G acts by linear substitutions via the representation homomorphism $\rho : G \to \mathrm{Aut}(V) = GL(V)$. Equivalently V is a finitely generated $K[G]$-module, where $K[G]$ is a group ring. So if $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is a basis for the dual space $V^* = \mathrm{Hom}_K(V, K)$, then $K[V^*] = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n] = K \oplus V^* \oplus S^2(V^*) \oplus S^3(V^*) \oplus \ldots$, where $S^m(V^*)$, the symmetric mth power of V^*, comprises degree m homogeneous polynomials in $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. For example $S^2(V^*)$ has a basis consisting of the monomials $x_i x_j$ for the $\binom{n+1}{2}$ choices of i and j. The vector space dimension of $S^m(V^*)$ is $\binom{n+m-1}{m}$. Regarding each x_i as having degree one makes $K[V]$ a graded ring. If the G-action on $K[V]$ is defined by $(gf)(v) := f(g^{-1}v)$, then the set of all fixed points of this action is the *ring of invariants* $K[V]^G$. If $G = \mathrm{Sym}(n)$, then $K[V]^{\mathrm{Sym}(n)} = K[e_1, \ldots, e_n]$, where the e_i are the elementary symmetric polynomials in the x_i $(1 \le i \le n)$. Also if H is a finite permutation group then $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{N}) \,\mathrm{Wr}\, H}$ is isomorphic to the ring of invariants of the linear group G, where the wreath product is considered in its imprimitive action. In particular, if $G = \mathrm{Sym}(\mathbb{N}) \,\mathrm{Wr}\, \mathrm{Sym}(n)$, then $\mathcal{A}^G$ is a polynomial ring in generators of degree $1, 2, \ldots, n$.

The *profile* [**444**] [**445**] of a relational structure M is the function ϕ_M which counts for every integer n the (possibly infinite) number of substructures of M induced on non-isomorphic n-element subsets. The profile depends only on the age $\mathcal{A}$ of M, and we can associate many graded algebras with M such that ϕ_M is the Hilbert function. One such graded algebra is Cameron's above-mentioned age algebra $K\mathcal{A}(M)$ over a field K. The profile in this case is the dimension of the homogeneous component of degree n, and so $H_{\phi_M} := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi_M(n) Z^n$ is the Hilbert series of $K\mathcal{A}(M)$. For a universal graph, the age is all finite graphs and the profile is $\phi_n \sim 2^{n(n-1)/2}/n!$. For the random graph $\mathfrak{R}$, the age is the free commutative algebra generated by the connected

graphs and the Hilbert series is $H_{\mathfrak{R}}(Z) = \prod_{d\geq 1} \frac{1}{(1-Z^d)^{c_n}}$, where c_n is the number of n-vertex connected graphs.

For structures obeying certain conditions the *invariant ring* of a finite permutation group was found by Pouzet and Thiéry [**444**] to be isomorphic to some $K\mathcal{A}$. If a group G acts on $\{1,\ldots,k\}$, the Hilbert function of the subalgebra $K[X]^G$ of the polynomials in the algebra $K[X] = K[X_1,\ldots,X_k]$ which are invariant under G-action is called the *orbital profile*. It counts the number of orbits of n-element subsets; oligomorphic groups have orbital profiles taking only finite values.

Let $\mathcal{M} := (\Omega, (R_i)_{i\in I})$ be a relational structure, where the R_i are n_i-ary relations on the domain Ω. To each size-d subset $S \subset \Omega$, associate the monomial $x^{d(S)} := \prod_{i\in X} x_i^{d_i(S)}$, where $d_i(S) = |S \cap \Omega_i|$ for all $i \in X$. To each orbit of sets, associate the unique maximal *leading monomial* $\mathrm{lm}(S)$, where S ranges through the orbit. In order to prove that the Hilbert generating series of a certain profile is a rational function of a certain form, Pouzet and Thiéry [**444**] endow the set of leading monomials with and *ideal* structure in an appropriate polynomial ring. In particular, if lm_C is the set of leading monomials with chain $C = (\subsetneq S_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq S_l \subsetneq X)$ of subsets as support, they realized lm_C as the linear basis of some *ideal* of a polynomial ring, so that the generating series of lm_C is realized as a Hilbert series. There is a natural polynomial ring embedding $K[S_1,\ldots,S_l] \to K[X] : S_j \mapsto \prod_{i\in S_j} x_i$. Infinite relational structures with a constant profile, equal to 1, were called *monomorphic*. Relations admitting a finite monomorphic decomposition have age algebras that are graded subalgebras of finitely generated polynomial algebras. When all monomorphic components are infinite, the monomial ideal spanned by monomials $m = S_1^{r_1}\ldots S_l^{r_l}$ such that $d_i(m) > |\Omega_i|$ for some i, is the trivial ideal $\{0\}$.

Much is known about the growth of a profile [**90**] but less is known about 'local' conditions relating individual values of ϕ_n, however it can be proved either using Ramsey-type theorem or using finite combinatorics and linear algebra that $\phi_n \leq \phi_{n+1}$. So the profile of an infinite relational structure $\mathcal{M}$ is nondecreasing. Furthermore, if the relations constituting $\mathcal{M}$ have bounded arity or the kernel of $\mathcal{M}$ is finite, its growth rate is either polynomial or faster than every polynomial [**439**]. If $\mathcal{M}$ is an infinite relational structure with a finite monomorphic decomposition, then its generating Hilbert series is a rational fraction and its orbital profile is bounded by some polynomial, that is $\phi_{\mathcal{M}} \sim an^{k-1}$ [**444**].

A conjecture of Cameron that remains open is that the orbital profile of an $\aleph_0$-categorical structure is polynomial provided it is bounded by a polynomial.

Pouzet's Theorem mentioned above has the following consequence: if G has no finite orbits then $\phi_{m+n} \geq \phi_m + \phi_{n-1}$. This is because multiplication induces a map from the Segre variety (the rank 1 tensors modulo scalars) in $V_m \otimes V_n$ into V_{m+n} modulo scalars; so the dimension of V_{m+n} is at least as great as that of the Segre variety [**105**].

If G has no finite orbits then e is prime in $\mathcal{A}^G$, that is $\mathcal{A}^G/\langle e\rangle$ is an integral domain. This implies that the profile of the relational structure satisfies $\psi_{m+n} \geq \psi_m + \psi_{n-1}$, where $\psi_n = \phi_{n+1} - \phi_n$. (This follows by an application of the Segre variety argument to $\mathcal{A}/\langle e\rangle$, whose nth homogeneous component is V_{n+1}/eV_n, with dimension $\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n$).

Our final result on profiles is the following result which appears in [**440**], to which we refer for details.

A.57. Proposition. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the age of a relational structure $\mathcal{M}$ such that the profile of $\mathcal{M}$ takes only finite values and $K\mathcal{A}$ be its age algebra. If $\mathcal{A}'$ is an initial segment of $\mathcal{A}$ then:*

(i) The vector subspace $\mathscr{J} := K(\mathcal{A}\backslash\mathcal{A}')$ spanned by $\mathcal{A}\backslash\mathcal{A}'$ is an ideal of $K\mathcal{A}$.

Moreover, the quotient of $K\mathcal{A}$ by $\mathscr{J}$ is a ring isomorphic to the ring $K\mathcal{A}'$.

(ii) If this ideal is irreducible then $\mathcal{A}'$ is a subage of $\mathcal{A}$.

(iii) This is a prime ideal if and only if $\mathcal{A}'$ is an inexhaustible age.

We end with an application [**417**, p.95] of invariant theory is towards counting *weighted graphs*, that is graphs which have a weight $m_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}$ attached to every edge. A *weighted isomorphism* between two weighted graphs is a bijection ϕ mapping edges onto edges of the same weight. Counting invariants of the same representation type gives the number of isomorphism classes of n-vertex weighted graphs. Briefly, $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ acts on the polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[x_{ij}|1 \leq i < j \leq n]$ in $\binom{n}{2}$ variables by acting on the indices,

$$s(x_{ij}) = \begin{cases} x_{s(i)s(j)} & \text{if } s(i) < s(j), \\ x_{s(j)s(i)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If the basis elements x_{ij} are arranged in a symmetric matrix

$$X_{ij} = \begin{cases} x_{ij} & \text{for } i < j, \\ x_{ji} & \text{for } i > j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

with zeroes on the diagonal, then $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$ acts by conjugation, $sX_{ij}s^{-1}$, where we have identified $s \in \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ with its image under the defining representation. If $\underline{m} = (m_{ij})$ then two weighted graphs Γ, Γ' are isomorphic if and only if $p(\underline{m}) = p(\underline{m'})$ for all invariant polynomials

$p \in \mathbb{C}[x_{ij} | 1 \le i < j \le n]^{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}$, where $s \in \mathrm{Sym}(n)$ such that $\underline{m} = s(\underline{m'})$ gives the graph isomorphism.

12. Enumeration, Growth Rates and Reconstruction

We will give the briefest of introductions to these three topics.

Enumeration

Let M be a countable homogeneous structure with age $\mathcal{A}$ and let $G = \mathrm{Aut}(M)$. By homogeneity, two finite subsets of M lie in the same G-orbit if and only if the induced substructures are isomorphic. So the sequence enumerating *unlabelled* n-element members of $\mathcal{A}$ (that is, up to isomorphism) is identical with the sequence enumerating the G-orbits on unordered n-element subsets of M. Similarly, the number of *labelled* n-element members of $\mathcal{A}$ (that is, members of $\mathcal{A}$ on the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$) is equal to the number of G-orbits on ordered n-tuples of distinct elements M.

Let G be an oligomorphic permutation group acting on each of the sets Ω^n (all n-tuples of elements of Ω), $\Omega^{(n)}$ (all n-tuples of distinct elements of Ω), and $\Omega^{\{n\}}$ (all n-element subsets of Ω). If F_n^*, F_n and f_n denote these numbers of orbits then $f_n \le F_n \le n! f_n$, since each orbit on n-sets corresponds to at least one and most $n!$ orbits on n-tuples. A permutation group is *n-transitive* if $F_n = 1$, and *n-homogeneous* if $f_n = 1$.

Also,

$$F_n^* = \sum_{k=1}^{n} S(n,k) F_k,$$

where $S(n,k)$ is the Stirling number of the second kind, the number of partitions of an n-set into k parts [**127**]. For an orbit $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)^G$ on n-tuples determines, and is determined by, a partition of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ into k parts (where i and j lie in the same part if $\alpha_i = \alpha_j$) and an orbit on k-tuples of distinct elements. The *exponential generating function* is given by $F(t) = \sum \frac{F_n t^n}{n!}$. The series $F(t)$ for a direct product (in the intransitive action) or a wreath product (in the imprimitive action) can be calculated from those of the factors:

$$F_{G \times H}(t) = F_G(t) \times F_H(t),$$

$$F_{G \,\mathrm{Wr}\, H}(t) = F_H(t)(F_G(t) - 1).$$

If $S = \mathrm{Sym}(\omega)$ and the sequence x is realized by a group G, then Sx is realized by $G \,\mathrm{Wr}\, S$.

Let G act transitively on Ω, and G_α be the stabilizer of the point $\alpha \in \Omega$. It can be shown that

$$F_{G_\alpha}(t) = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t} F_G(t),$$

or equivalently differentiating an exponential generating function corresponds to shifting the sequence terms one place to the left,

$$F_n(G_\alpha) = F_{n+1}(G).$$

So there is an equivalence between G_α-orbits on n-tuples and of G orbits on $(n+1)$-tuples. If G is intransitive, then the derivative of $F_G(t)$ gives the sum of $F_{G_\alpha}(t)$, over a set of representatives α of the orbits of G.

For any oligomorphic group G, *generalized Stirling numbers* denoted by $S[G](n,k)$, can be defined [**99**] that obey

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} S[G](n,k) = F_n(G \operatorname{Wr} S),$$

and have the composition property

$$\sum_{l=k}^{n} S[G](n,l) S[H](l,k) = S[G \operatorname{Wr} H](n,k).$$

The last result can be expressed in terms of infinite lower triangular matrices of generalized Stirling numbers. There is also a statement in terms of Joyal's theory of species [**39**] [**319**].

There is a linear analogue of the combinatorics of sets and functions that applies to vector spaces over finite fields and linear transformations in which the Gaussian (or q-binomial coefficient) replaces the binomial coefficient [**127**]. These coefficients enumerate the number of k-dimensional subspaces of n-dimensional $GF(q)$-vector space [**320**].

Growth Rates

There are general theorems on growth rates of counting sequences, many of them requiring a primitive permutation group $G = \mathrm{Aut}(M)$, for example if $M = \mathfrak{R}$. Though primitivity is not a first-order concept, it can be completely described if G is oligomorphic.

If is known that $f_{n+1} \geq f_n$ for all n, that is, the sequence (f_n) is non-decreasing, as proved in [**90**]. Macpherson showed there to be a gap in growth rates between constant and exponential:

A.58. Theorem. *If G is an oligomorphic permutation group which is primitive but not highly set-transitive then there exists a constant c such that $f_n > c^n$ for all sufficiently large n.*

Macpherson proves the theorem holds with $c = 2^{\frac{1}{5}} - \epsilon$. There is a variant of this theorem that does not require primitivity due to Pouzet [**437**] and Macpherson [**371**]

A.59. THEOREM. *Let G be an oligomorphic permutation group.*

(a) $c_1 n^d \leq f_n \leq c_2 n^d$ for all n, where d is a non-negative integer and c_1, c_2 positive constants; or

(b) $f_n \geq exp(n^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon})$ for all sufficiently large n.

There are known examples in the growth rate spectrum lying between $exp(n^{\frac{p}{p+1}-\epsilon})$ and $exp(n^{\frac{p}{p+1}+\epsilon})$, as well as faster than any fractional exponential $exp(n^c)$ for any $c < 1$ but slower than straight exponential c^n for $c > 1$. Macpherson has studied [**373**] permutation groups of rapid growth, that is faster than exponential, and established connections with model-theoretic properties related to stability.

Macpherson's bound was improved by Merola [**394**], who shows that if G is an infinite primitive permutation group which is not highly homogeneous (so for some n has more than one orbit on n-sets) then the number of orbits on n-tuples of distinct elements is, for large enough n, bounded below by $\frac{c^n n!}{p_G(n)}$, where $p_G(n)$ is a G-dependent polynomial, and the result is proved with the constant $c \cong 1.172$; she proves that 2 is an upper bound for c. The proof is an induction on the degree of transitivity, considering the cases when G acts on a graph (when G is not 2homogeneous), or a tournament (when G is 2-homogeneous but not 2-transitive), or a Steiner system (one of the possibilities in the 2-transitive not 2-primitive case). Merola finds lower bounds for the numbers of labelled size n substructures of these structures.

Therefore counting orbits of an oligomorphic permutation group on ordered or unordered n-sets is the same as enumerating labelled or unlabelled structures in a Fraïssé class [**99**].

More recently, the following has been proved [**444**]

A.60. THEOREM (Pouzet, Thiéry). *Let $\mathcal{M} := (X, (\rho_i)_{i\in I})$ be a relational structure on an infinite set X. Let $\phi_{\mathcal{M}}$ be a non-decreasing profile. If either the signature $\mu := (n_i)_{i\in I}$ is bounded or the kernel* $\ker(\mathcal{M})$ *of $\mathcal{M}$ is finite, then the growth of $\phi_{\mathcal{M}}$ is either polynomial or as fast as every polynomial*

Conditions equivalent to the profile of $\mathcal{M}$ being bounded are given in [**444**].

Reconstruction

The Vertex Reconstruction Conjecture of Kelly [**330**] is one of the most famous unsolved problems in graph theory, and is a statement

about graphs being uniquely determined by their subgraphs. A *vertex-deleted subgraph* is an induced subgraph formed by deleting one vertex from a graph Γ. If $D(\Gamma)$ is the *deck*, that is the set of all vertex-deleted subgraphs, then call two graphs having the same deck *hypomorphic*. The conjecture states that

A.61. Conjecture. *Any two hypomorphic graphs on at least three vertices are isomorphic.*

For an algebraic formulation of the conjecture, take $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$, so that a basis for the G-invariant functions V_n^G (where G acts on V_n naturally: $f^g(X) = f(Xg^{-1})$), consists of the characteristic functions χ_Γ of all unlabelled n-vertex graphs Γ. Since $e \in V_1^G$ is not a zero-divisor, multiplication by e is a monomorphism from $V_n^G \to V_{n+1}^G$ for all n. Consider the map $\theta = \theta_n : V_n^G \to V_{n-1}^G$ which is dual to multiplication by e:

$$\theta(\chi_\Gamma) = \sum_{x \in \Gamma} \chi_{\Gamma \setminus \{x\}}.$$

The map θ takes the graph Γ to the sum of the graphs in its deck of vertex-deleted subgraphs. Since e is one-to-one, θ is onto. More generally, if G is any oligomorphic group then G-orbits on n-sets replace the characteristic functions.

Variants of this conjecture for graphs and other classes of structures are discussed in [**99**] [**100**] and [**352**]. Also noteworthy is the reformulation of the edge-reconstruction conjecture by V. Mnukhin [**397**] [**398**], in terms of orbit reconstructions of an arbitrary finite permutation group, based on embedding the set of orbits in an *orbit algebra*. Other approaches are listed in [**103**, p. 67], amongst which we mention that of Joyal's theory of combinatorial species [**39**] [**319**].

13. Cartan Triality and Eight-Dimensional Exotica

The triality property of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ has been sufficiently significant in directing one of our lines of research as to warrant a section outlining the basic motivating finite theory whose infinite version we used to demonstrate the connection.

This section is a brief introduction to the exceptional $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$ outer automorphisms that arises for the groups $\mathrm{PSO}(8)$ and $\mathrm{Spin}(8)$ (but not for $\mathrm{SO}(8)$, which is the light cone restriction of the Lorentz group $\mathrm{SO}(9,1)$). Though discovered by É. Cartan [**131**], in fact the oldest phenomenon associated with triality predates Cartan and is connected to complex quadrics [**2**] [**92**]; see [**507**]. We will follow the usual textbook account where it will transpire that the Clifford algebra for a given real or complex vector space has an associated quadratic form

which contains in its multiplicative group a subgroup which is a double cover of the orthogonal group of automorphisms of the space preserving the form. We summarize the theory as expounded in [**146**].

Within the main text, we shall prove that the action of the colour group $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$ on the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ of the triality graph, in a sense originates in a generalization of the *Cartan triality* group action.

Vectors are preserved under a rotation of 2π. Spinors are objects that require a 4π rotation to return to their original value; this explains their occurrence in describing half-integer spin elementary particles, fermions. That the angular momenta of the emitter has half-integral units (as multiples of Planck's constant) of the quantized spin can be discerned by the emitted photons. This appears in Dirac's spinor solutions of his equations for the electron. It also indicates why we may expect spaces of both such objects to arise in representations of the rotation group. In 8 dimensions, we have an extra symmetry that is unique to spaces of this dimensionality.

Let V be an 8-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{R}$ for which we can take without loss of generality the quadratic form to be $q = x_1x_2 + x_3x_4 + x_5x_6 + x_7x_8$ with two maximal totally singular subspaces being $\langle e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\rangle$ and $\langle e_5, e_6, e_7, e_8\rangle$ in terms of standard basis vectors. This leads to a *Clifford algebra* denoted by $CA = CA(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$, $r_i \in \mathbb{R}$ (field of char $\neq 2$), which is the free $\mathbb{R}$-algebra $\mathbb{R}\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ over indeterminates $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ satisfying relations $x^2 = q(x).1$.

For example over the field $\mathbb{R}$, $CA(-1) = \mathbb{C}$. The two-sided ideal of the relevant tensor algebra (to be defined below) $I(q) \subset T(V)$ is generated by even degree elements. This induces a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ grading on the Clifford algebra $CA = CA^+ \oplus CA^-$ with $CA^+ \cdot CA^+ \subset CA^+$, $CA^- \cdot CA^- \subset CA^+$, $CA^+ \cdot CA^- \subset CA^-$, $CA^- \cdot CA^+ \subset CA^-$. The dimension 2^{n-1} subalgebra CA^+ is spanned by products of an even number of elements in V.

It transpires [**228**] that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(q) = \mathfrak{so}(n, \mathbb{R})$ embeds inside the Lie algebra of the even part of the Clifford algebra and that the Clifford algebra can be identified with one or two copies of matrix algebras. Now let S be the space of spinors or spin representations of CA with $\dim S = 16$ and $S = S^+ \oplus S^-$. Then on each of the half-spin representations of $\mathfrak{so}(n, \mathbb{R})$, written S^+, S^- there is a quadratic form isomorphic to the original form on V. Algebraic triality results from the order 3 mapping $J : V \to S^+ \to S^- \to V$.

For any $2n$-dimensional vector space V, the Clifford algebra has dimension $2^{2n} \cong M_{2^n \times 2^n}(\mathbb{R})$, a space of matrices. Then $S = S^+ \oplus S^-$

gives dim S^+ = dim S^- = 2^{n-1}. Triality occurs only when $2n' = 2^{n'-1}$, that is only when $n' = 4$ that is $n = 8$.

The following is a flow-chart that gives the key ingredients of the derivation of this algebraic triality together with an explanation of the terms:


V : 8 dimensional vector space
T : tensor algebra
$CA\ (= T/I)$: Clifford algebra of q with $|CA| = 2^8$
ρ_s (spinor representation)
S : spinor space of the CA representation with $|S| = 2^4$
CG : Clifford group of q
$CG_0^+ = CG_0 \cap CG^+$: Reduced Clifford group
χ
$\chi(CG_0^+) = \Omega^+(8, \mathbb{R})$: Reduced orthogonal group

FIGURE 3. Pictorial synopsis of 8–dimensional Cartan triality

- $T = T^+ \oplus T^- = \sum_{k\ even} \otimes^k V \oplus \sum_{k\ odd} \otimes^k V = F \oplus V \oplus (V \otimes V) \oplus \ldots$
- The ideal I of T is generated by $x \otimes x - q(x) \cdot 1$.
- $CG = \langle$invertible elements $s \in CA : sxs^{-1} \in V,\ \forall x \in V\rangle$.
- $CG^+ = CG \cap CA^+$ is the special Clifford group of q, where $CA^+ = T^+/(I \cap T^+)$.
- The 'main anti-automorphism' of CA is a linear map on T given by $\alpha(x_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes x_k) = x_k \otimes \ldots \otimes x_1$.
- $CG_0 = \{s \in CG : \alpha(s)s = 1\}$, α is the main anti-automorphism of CA.
- CG_0^+ has three inequivalent 8-dimensional representations via ρ on V and the half-spinor spaces S^+, S^-.
- The linear map $\chi : x \mapsto sxs^{-1}$ is a vector representation of CG.

• $|O^+(8,\mathbb{R}) : \chi(CG^+)| = 2$, and $\Omega^+(8,\mathbb{R})$ is the commutator subgroup of $O^+(8,\mathbb{R})$.

• If $char(F) \neq 2$ then $|\chi(CG^+)| = |SO^+(8,\mathbb{R})|$. If $char(F) = 2$ then every element of $O^+(8,\mathbb{R})$ has unit determinant; the determinant of a reflection is -1.

• $\rho_s(CG_0^+)$ preserves a quadratic form j on S.

• There is an order 3 mapping $J : V \to S^+ \to S^- \to V$ such that:

$$j(J(x)) = q(x)$$
$$j(J(u)) = j(u)$$
$$q(J(u')) = j(u'),$$

for $x \in V, u \in S^+, u' \in S^-$, and for some quadratic form j.

• the map J yields a *triality* map τ_{CA} that gives outer automorphisms of $P\Omega^+(8,\mathbb{R})$. As mentioned at the beginning of the section, there is a geometrical version of this algebraic triality due to E. Study, mapping 1-dimensional singular subspaces to 4-dimensional totally singular subspaces; an account of this is given in [**92**].

Triality is only non-trivial for orthogonal groups in 8 dimensions. Put slightly differently, it is only in 8 dimensions that there is a Moufang loop available to create a non-trivial triality; see Appendix 14.

Note from [**158**] that $\mathrm{Spin}(7) \cap \mathrm{Spin}(7) \subset \mathrm{Spin}(8)$ for any two of the three pairs of $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$. If $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathrm{SO}(8)$ then the surjection $\mathrm{Spin}(8) \to \mathrm{SO}(8) : \{(\alpha,\beta,\gamma), (-\alpha,-\beta,\gamma) \mapsto \gamma\}$ is 2–1. In fact one way of knowing that the Cartan triality automorphisms are outer is because they act nontrivially on the centre of $\mathrm{Spin}(8)$ which is

$$\{(1,1,1),\ (1,-1,-1),\ (-1,1,-1),\ (-1,-1,1)\}.$$

The group $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ is 'almost' as big as $SO(8)$ in the sense that $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ also acts transitively on spheres in $\mathbb{R}^8$ [**272**, p.283]. The elements of $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ are those elements of $\mathrm{Spin}(8)$ that stabilize a vector in one of the three eight-dimensional vector spaces V^8, S^+, S^- representing the three irreducible representations of $\mathrm{PSO}(8)$. The three copies of $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ in $\mathrm{Spin}(8)$ have as elements the triples (α,β,γ) for which γ (respectively α,β) fix 1 [**158**, p. 95]. There are $\binom{3}{2}$ ways of doing this and the triality automorphism τ_C (where $\tau_C^3 = 1$) maps each of the 3 non-isomorphic copies of $\mathrm{Spin}(7)$ into $\mathrm{Spin}(8)$.

Let us discuss some of the occurences of the Cartan outer automorphisms. An outer automorphism is a coset of inner automorphisms and it permutes the conjugacy classes of representations of a group. The Lie group D_4 is the compact, connected and simply-connected group

Spin(8), and has the largest outer automorphisms of all the Lie groups, these being isomorphic to Sym(3). The exceptional Jordan algebra $\mathfrak{h}_3(\mathbb{O})$ is a 27-dimensional real vector space consisting of all 3×3 Hermitian symmetric matrices over $\mathbb{O}$ of the form $\begin{pmatrix} a & z & \bar{y} \\ \bar{z} & b & x \\ y & \bar{x} & c \end{pmatrix}$ with $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x, y, z \in \mathbb{O}$. If Spin(8) is embedded in $F_4 = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{h}_3(\mathbb{O}))$ then the Sym(3) action can be effected by conjugation by elements of F_4 [**3**]. The finite versions of Cartan triality arise by taking the simple groups $G = D_4(\mathbb{F}_q) = P\Omega^+(8, \mathbb{F}_q)$ over finite fields. If $\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$ is the root lattice of the E_8 Lie algebra and $W_{\mathbb{L}_{E_8}}$ is its Weyl group, then the determinant one subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{L}_{E_8})/\{\pm 1\}$ is isomorphic to $SO^+(8, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$, or alternatively $W_{\mathbb{L}_{E_8}}/\zeta(W_{\mathbb{L}_{E_8}}) \cong W_{E_8}/\{\pm 1\} \cong O^+(8, 2)$. The group $P\Omega^+(8, \mathbb{F}_q)$ which has index 2 in $PSO^+(8, \mathbb{F}_q) = SO^+(8, \mathbb{F}_q)/(\{\pm\} \cap SO^+(8, \mathbb{F}_q))$, has its own Cartan triality outer automorphism group.

The group $\mathrm{Spin}(n)$ is the simply connected covering group of $\mathrm{SO}(n)$ and the group homomorphism $\pi : \mathrm{Spin}(n) \to \mathrm{SO}(n)$ has kernel of order 2 if $char(F) \neq 2$ and kernel of order 1 if $char(F) = 2$. The reduction mod 2 homomorphism $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}) \to \mathrm{SL}(2, 2) \cong \mathrm{Sym}(3)$, has as kernel matrices congruent to the identity matrix mod 2. There is an action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ on Spin(8) giving the semidirect product $Spin(8) \rtimes \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ that characterises *S-duality*, conjectured to be an exact symmetry of full string theory [**234**] [**479**], whereby the Spin(8) vector (v), spinor (s) and conjugate spinor (c) representations of the number of magnetic and electric charges, (n_m, n_e), these being coprime integers, are determined by the following hypermultiplet of states:

$$(0, 1) \to \mathbf{8_v};\ (1, 0) \to \mathbf{8_s};\ (1, 1) \to \mathbf{8_c}.$$

That the irreducible representations, $\mathbf{8_v}, \mathbf{8_s}, \mathbf{8_c}$, of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}_8$ are related to one another by the triality automorphism was known to E. Study [**507**]. It may be worth pursuing a new graph-theoretic approach to the physics using the idea that (0, 1), (1, 0) and (1, 1) represent the 3 types of adjacency of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$.

The group $\mathrm{Spin}(8) \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ is the automorphism group of many different algebras, and yields invariant subgroups of exceptional type G_2 [**332**].

We list some of the theories where the appearance of Cartan triality has been essential to a description of the phenomena.

In [**487**] an application of triality is given to solvable models, one a quantum Ising model of spins in statistical mechanics and the other the $O(8)$ Gross-Neveu model in quantum field theory; it is shown that this triality is the origin of the fermionic solutions.

In [**248**] the basic representation of the E_8 Kac-Moody algebra is constructed out of 16 real Fermi fields, themselves constructed out of 8 real Bose fields, and the triality properties of the eight-dimensional orthogonal group were used in a crucial way. In an analysis of the algebraic structure of fermions interrelated by the vertex operator construction [**249**], triality is realized via orbit triples, just as it will be in our Leech lattice ($\mathbb{L}_L$) construction of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, (see the main text).

More recently the triality automorphism has had other manifestations. For example, as an automorphism of both the Griess algebra [**253**] whose automorphism group is the Monster group $\mathbb{M}$ and of the Monster module $V^{\natural}$ [**223**], as well as inside the lattice vertex operator algebra (VOA) constructed from a marked binary doubly-even self-dual code [**255**]. (A marked, length $2n$ binary code is a partition of the $2n$ coordinates into n sets of size 2). The results of [**223**] giving the natural representation of $\mathbb{M}$ as a conformal field theory were extended [**178**] [**179**] to produce untwisted and $\mathbb{Z}_2$-twisted theories constructed from even self-dual lattices or binary codes which also possess a triality. In each case the twisting or intertwining effected by the triality is essential to the construction. A $\mathbb{Z}_3$ analogue of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-twisted construction of [**223**] is given in [**559**] where a ternary moonshine space is constructed which is closed under intertwining operators and in some instances is an operand under automorphic braid group action.

Codicil

The objects and phenomena of most depth, beauty and importance in mathematics are often the exceptional ones; see the review article [**20**].

Consider the following:

Cayley-Graves Octonions $\mathbb{O}$
Exceptional Lie Groups (e.g. G_2, F_4)
Moufang Projective Plane $\mathbb{OP}^2$
Exceptional Jordan Algebra $\mathfrak{h}_3(\mathbb{O})$
Cartan Triality Outer Automorphism
Exceptional Hopf Map
Bott Periodicity
Leech Lattice $\mathbb{L}_L$
Fischer-Griess Monster Group $\mathbb{M}$

On this list are a number system, a small set of continuous groups, a projective plane, an algebra, a coset of a group action, a fibration, a topological property, a lattice and a finite group. In one sense or another, these are all considered to be exceptions in their class and

it would be interesting to find more among other branches of mathematics. For example consider singularity theory which amongst other things classifies singular objects in terms of their complexity. Some of the types are *stable* singularities which are immutable to small perturbations, whilst *simple* ones arise as a finite number of non-equivalent cases under small perturbations, and Kleinian singularities are associated with finite subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$. Arnold's strange duality in this field has been related to $\mathbb{L}_L$ [**191**], so perhaps this points to a candidate special singularity.

As an example of the almost inexhaustible number of applications of D_4 is the construction by Kantor [**321**] of a geometry which is almost a building whose diagram is the extended D_4, in which a middle node has four neighbours.

J. Milnor proved in 1956 that there are 28 different smooth structures on the manifold S^7, with $\mathbb{Z}_{28}$ acting on them. The octonionic Hopf map is the projection $p_{\mathbb{O}} : E_{\mathbb{O}} \to \mathbb{OP}^1$, with total space $E_{\mathbb{O}}$ consisting of all unit vectors in $\mathbb{O}^2$, so is a $2.8 - 1 = 15$-dimensional sphere S^{15}, and with base space S^8. The projection is a Hopf bundle of 7-spheres over $\mathbb{OP}^1$ with a unit 7-sphere in each fibre. Bott Periodicity is the property of the homotopy groups of the topological group $O(\infty)$ (a direct limit of Orthogonal groups $O(n)$ as $n \to \infty$) given by $\pi_{i+8}(O(\infty)) \cong \pi_i(O(\infty))$. The above objects are inter-related and are all exceptional in some real sense [**495**] [**505**]. This is a subjective list and perhaps other entries can be added. The octonions are thought to be the linchpin of exceptionality [**20**] [**505**] and it appears that Cartan triality is a signature. The concrete realization of Spin(8) using the octonions has several applications [**272**, p.279]. The two exceptional tesselations of $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{C}$ are both built on the lattice of Eisenstein integers [**505**], in terms of which we will construct $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ in one of the chapters. Analogously in the lattice of 'integer octonions' in $\mathbb{R}^8$, the neighbours of each lattice point form the Gosset polytope which is not regular but has E_8 as its symmetry group. Finally, the idea that octonions can be made to be commutative and associative within the context of a symmetric monoidal category [**9**] by transferring the nonassociativity to a suitable product operation, may have an important part to play in future developments.

Whilst dualities are in plentiful supply in mathematics, trialities require a subtleness that makes them rarer. Equally, outer automorphisms are much less frequently occurring than the inner ones got by conjugation. Any division algebra yields a triality, so trialities potentially occur in dimensions $1, 2, 4, 8$. B. Kostant found that the outer automorphisms of Spin(8) are the *reason* for the existence of the five

exceptional Lie groups [**339**] [**464**]. It would be nice to amass sufficient evidence to add $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ as an asterisked footnote to the above list.

Another piece of evidence for the theory that is often asserted that the exceptional Lie groups all exist because of the octonions is the Freudenthal-Tits magic square, and its variations; see for example [**31**] [**224**] [**225**] [**522**] [**540**].

14. Loop Theory and Groups with Triality

A *magma* is a set with a single binary operation. A *semigroup* is a magma whose binary operation is associative. Let L be a *quasigroup* that is a *magma* with unique division, and $\mathrm{Mlt}(L)$ the *multiplication group* of L, which is generated by the set of all left and right *translation maps* that is the permutations defined by $L_a(x) = ax$ and $R_a(x) = xa$ for every $x \in L$. Clearly, $M(L)$ acts transitively on L and the stabilizers of the elements of L are conjugated in L. Another definition of a *quasigroup* is a magma $(G, \cdot)$ in which the maps $L(a) : G \to G$ and $R(a) : G \to G$ are bijections for all $a \in G$. (We should say that *unique division* means that $\forall l_1, l_2$ in a quasigroup $(L, \circ)$ there exist unique elements $x, y \in L$ such that: $l_1 \circ x = l_2$ and $y \circ l_1 = l_2$. The unique solutions to these equations are written $x = l_1 \backslash l_2$ and $y = l_2 / l_1$. The operations $\backslash$ and $/$ are called, respectively, left and right division.)

For a group G, the right multiplication group is isomorphic to G (thus proving Cayley's Theorem.) For an arbitrary quasigroup, the right multiplication group will be larger than G (it will act transitively but not regularly on G). In fact, for a random finite quasigroup, the right multiplication group is the symmetic group (all permutations of G) with high probability. Some of the best structural results on quasigroups come from studying their multiplication groups.

A *loop* of order n is a set L of n elements with an identity element e satisfying $ex = xe = x \ \forall x \in L$ and such that for $a, b \in L$, the equations $ax = b$ and $ya = b$ each has a unique solution in L. The multiplication table is a Latin square, which is a square array of n^2 cells containing the numbers $1, \ldots, n$ in such a way that no number appears twice in either the same row or in the same column. The Latin square may be regarded as a 'global' object as compared to a 'local' loop. The binary operation defined by a Latin square need not be associative. If the Latin square is symmetric, then the corresponding loop is commutative. A quasigroup is precisely a structure whose operation table is a Latin square; it is a loop precisely when, assuming that the first element is the identity, the first row and column are the same as the row and column labels.

If L is a *loop*, that is a quasigroup with a neutral/identity element e and inverses, then the *inner mapping group* $I(L)$ of L is the stabilizer of e; this is the analogue for loops of the inner automorphism group of a group. The loop L is an abelian group if and only if $I(L) = 1$. If L is a group, then $I(L)$ consists of the inner automorphisms of L.

Note one difference between the theories of semigroups and quasigroups. In a semigroup, the associative law holds, so we can write products unambiguously. In a quasigroup or loop, we would have to specify which of the possible bracketings of a product is intended.

For a loop L, the transversals $A = \{L_a : a \in L\}$ and $B = \{R_a : a \in L\}$ are $I(L)$-*connected* to $I(L)$ in $\mathrm{Mlt}(L) = \langle A, B\rangle$ if $[A, B] \leq I(L)$.

Many of the concepts that arise in group theory have their equivalents in loop theory. For example, a non-empty subset H of a set G is a *subloop* of a quasigroup $(G, \cdot)$ if $(H, \cdot)$ is a loop. If H is a subloop of a loop L, and L has a left and right decomposition modulo H then H is a *normal subloop* if $lH = Hl$, $(l_1H)l_2 = l_1(Hl_2)$ and $l_1(l_2H) = (l_1l_2)H$. A *simple loop* is one with no non-trivial proper homomorphic images, that is it has no non-trivial proper normal subloops; alternatively phrased, if every surjective loop homomorphism is either bijective or has image the identity. Let H be a subloop and K a subset of a loop L. Then K is a *left (right) coset modulo* H if $K = aH$ $(K = Ha)$ for some $a \in L$. The *exponent* $exp(L)$ of a loop L is the smallest positive integer n for which $l^n = 1$ for all $l \in L$.

For a quasigroup L it is well-known that $\mathrm{Mlt}(L)$ is primitive on L if and only if L is simple. In [**434**] prove that L is simple if and only if $\mathrm{Mlt}(L)$ is quasiprimitive on L; (a quasiprimitive group has only transitive nontrivial normal subgroups, see Appendix 1). So transitive imprimitive quasiprimitive permutation groups cannot be multiplication groups of quasigroups [**448**]. Contrast this with the observation that for almost all quasigroups, $\mathrm{Mlt}(L) = \mathrm{Sym}(L)$. This fact follows either from the result of Łuczak and Pyber [**366**] that for almost all $g \in \mathrm{Sym}(L)$ the only transitive subgroups of $\mathrm{Sym}(L)$ containing g are $\mathrm{Sym}(L)$ and perhaps $\mathrm{Alt}(L)$, or the result of Häggkvist and Janssen [**262**] that $\mathrm{Mlt}(L)$ is almost never contained in $\mathrm{Alt}(L)$. Other than books on loops, a good reference for multiplication groups of loops is [**419**].

A *quasigroup homotopy* from quasigroup G_1 to G_2 is a triple (α, β, γ) of maps from G_1 to G_2 such that

$$\alpha(x)\beta(y) = \gamma(xy)$$

for all $x, y \in G_1$. A quasigroup homomorphism is just a homotopy for which the three maps are equal. An *isotopy* is a homotopy for which each of the three maps (α, β, γ) is a bijection. Two quasigroups are

isotopic if there is an isotopy between them. In terms of Latin squares, an isotopy (α, β, γ) is given by a permutation of rows α, a permutation of columns β, and a permutation on the underlying element set γ. An *autotopy* is an isotopy from a quasigroup to itself. The set of all autotopies of a quasigroup form a group with the automorphism group as a subgroup. Each quasigroup is isotopic to a loop.

A *Moufang loop,* named after Ruth Moufang [**405**] and denoted Q, is a set of elements with a binary operation, a unique product xy for every two elements x, y, an identity element 1, a unique inverse x^{-1} of x such that $x^{-1} \cdot x = 1 = x \cdot x^{-1}$, that satisfy a weak form of associativity given by any of the following equivalent conditions:

$$[x(zx)]y = x[z(xy)] \qquad [(xz)x]y = x[z(xy)]$$

$$(xy)(zx) = x[(yz)x] \qquad [(yx)z]x = y[x(zx)].$$

The last two conditions can be equivalently written as the following multiplication laws [**158**, p. 74]

$$(xzx) \cdot x^{-1}y = x(zy)$$

$$(yz)x = yx^{-1} \cdot (xzx).$$

Nonassociativity does not arise in compositions of pairs of Moufang elements. (Note that for permutation groups composition is always associative, and it only becomes necessary to invoke the associativity axiom for abstract groups.)

For loops in general, $I(L)$ is not an automorphism group but it is for commutative Moufang loops, that is loops satisfying $xx \cdot yz = xy \cdot xz$.

If M is a simple nonassociative Moufang loop, and $L(x) := m \to xm, R(x) := m \to mx$ $(m \in M)$, then $G(M) := \langle L(x), R(x) : x \in M \rangle$ is a group with triality. Every Moufang loop with trivial nucleus has an associated group with triality; for more such results see [**431**] [**432**].

Commutative Moufang loops (CML) can be defined by the relation

$$x^2(yz) = (xy)(xz)$$

and have the property that all cubes are central, that is the mapping $l \mapsto l^3$ is a centralizing endomorphism. Every loop-isotope of a CML also has centrally endomorphic cubing whilst commutativity itself is not an isotopic invariant. R. H. Bruck proved that any Moufang loop with centrally endomorphic cubing is either an isotope of a CML or is an index-3 normal subloop of such an isotope. It is possible for elements of a CML to have infinite order. If L is commutative then the square-root set of the identity is a subloop L' consisting of all elements of order 1 or 2, and any other square-root set is empty or a coset of L'. (This follows because $x^{-1}y^{-1}x^{-1}y = 1 \Rightarrow y = xyx \Rightarrow yz = (((x)y)x)z \Rightarrow yz =$

$(xy)(xz) \Rightarrow x^2(yz) = (xy)(xz)$, satisfying the condition for a CML), and the last equation implies that the elements of L' have order 1 or 2. Furthermore L' is a subloop because of closure of pre- and post-multiplication of any element of L' by another). So if $|L : L'| = \infty$, for example if L' has unbounded exponent, then L is $\mathfrak{R}_m$-genic.

The *nucleus* $\mathrm{Nuc}(Q)$ of a Moufang loop Q is defined by $\mathrm{Nuc}(Q) = \{x \in Q : \forall y, z \in Q, (xy)z = x(yz) \ \&\ cyc.\}$ If $C(Q) := \{x \in Q : \forall y \in Q, xy = yx\}$ is the *Moufang centre* then the *centre* is $\zeta(Q) := C(Q) \cap \mathrm{Nuc}(Q)$. Finally if $(L_1, \cdot)$ and $(L_2, \circ)$ are two loops and $\phi : L_1 \to L_2$ such that $(x \cdot y)\phi = x\phi \circ y\phi$, then ϕ is a *homomorphism* of $(L_1, \cdot)$ into $(L_2, \circ)$. A homomorphic image of a loop is not always a loop [**430**, p. 28], but we shall work only with those which are.

There is an associated incidence structure called a *3-net* [**75**], where the disjoint line classes are broken down as $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{L}_2 \sqcup \mathcal{L}_3$. Lines in each class are disjoint; lines from different classes meet in one point. The line classes are subsets of the point set $\mathcal{P} = Q \times Q$, and are given by $\mathcal{L}_1 = \{\{(x, c)\} : \ x \in Q\} : \ c \in Q\}$, $\mathcal{L}_2 = \{\{(c, y)\} : \ y \in Q\} : \ c \in Q\}$, $\mathcal{L}_3 = \{\{(x, y)\} : \ x, y \in Q\} : \ xy = c\} : \ c \in Q\}$; the element c is a constant. A *Bol reflection* about a fixed axis, say x = constant, is a particular permutation of the point set that stabilizes the line forming the axis; this is described in [**269**]. Bol proved that a 3-net is coordinatised by a Moufang loop if and only if any Bol reflection is a collineation. A *Latin square design* D is a pair of points P and lines A (subsets of P) such that (i) P is the disjoint union of 3 parts R, C, E, (ii) every line $l \in A$ contains exactly three points, meeting each of R, C, E once, (iii) every pair of points from different parts belong to exactly one line. Equivalently, it is a Latin square where the entry in row x and column y is $z \iff \langle x, y, z\rangle \in A$. The partial automorphism $\tau_x \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$ acting as $\tau_x(y) = z, \tau_x(z) = y \iff \langle x, y, z\rangle \in A$ extends to a permutation on all P such that $\{\tau_p |\ p \in P, \tau_p \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)\}$ is a set of involutions. If p and q belong to different parts of P and $\tau_p, \tau_q \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$, then $(\tau_p\tau_q)^3 = 1$. So τ_x extends to a permutation on all P; it is a *central automorphism* of L with centre x. More on Latin square designs can be found in [**266**] [**266**].

Bol proved the following [**53**]:

A.62. Theorem. *Let $(L, \cdot)$ be a loop. Then for every point x, $\tau_x \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$ if and only if*

$$(xa)(bx) = (x(ab))x, \qquad x, a, b \in L.$$

In other words Moufang loops satisfy this identity. Thus to every Moufang loop there is an associated automorphism group generated by a conjugacy class of involutions obeying

A.63. Proposition. *In* $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$ *there is at most one central automorphism* τ_p *with center* p *for each* $p \in \mathcal{P}$. *If* $\tau_p \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$, *then it has order 2. If* $\tau_p, \tau_q \in \mathrm{Aut}(D)$ *with* p, q *in different fibres, then* $\tau_p\tau_q$ *has order 3 and* $\langle \tau_p, \tau_q \rangle \cong \mathrm{Sym}(3)$. *If this is the case, then there is a unique conjugacy class* T *of central automorphisms in* $\mathrm{Aut}(D)$.

The converse relates Moufang loops to *groups with triality* $G = \langle T \rangle$ as studied by Glauberman [**244**] and Doro [**181**]. It states [**267**],

A.64. Theorem. *Let* T *be the conjugacy class of involutions in* $G = \langle T \rangle$, *and let* $\pi : G \to \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ *be an epimomorphism. Assume that* G *satisfies the hypothesis that if* $\pi(t) \neq \pi(r)$ *then* $|\pi(t)\pi(r)| = 3$, *for all* $t, r \in T$.

Then there is a Moufang loop $(q, \cdot)$ *with*

$$G/\zeta(G) \cong \mathrm{Aut}(D(Q,\cdot))^0,$$

where the class T *maps bijectively to the class of central automorphisms of* $\mathrm{Aut}(D(Q,\cdot))^0$, *the subgroup of* $\mathrm{Aut}(D(Q,\cdot))$ *generated by all central automorphisms.*

There is a category equivalence between loops and Latin square designs, a special case of which is a category equivalence between Moufang loops and those Latin square designs that admit all possible central automorphisms. These are in turn equivalent to an appropriate category of groups with triality [**267**].

The reason for the difference between Moufang loops and groups with triality is that different groups with triality correspond to the same central Latin square design (one admitting a central automorphism at every point). The problem has to do with centre of groups with triality. To every such group (G, T, π) there is a central quotient (G^A, T^A, π^A) where the centre is factored out, and a *universal group with triality* (G^U, T^U, π^U) which is a maximal (so universal) central extension. The distinction between these two classes gives the equivalence between the category of Moufang loops and the category of *universal* groups with triality.

In Chapter 6 we gave a précis of the theory of groups with triality as expounded in [**269**], via its relation to Moufang loop theory, elements of which was used in the main text, but we need to repeat the definition.

Doro [**181**] defined a pair (G, S) to be a *group with triality* if G is an abstract group, $S \leq \mathrm{Aut}(G), S = \langle \sigma, \rho \mid \sigma^2 = \rho^3 = (\sigma\rho)^2 = 1 \rangle \cong \mathrm{Sym}(3)$, and the *triality identity* given by $[g,\sigma][g,\sigma]^\rho[g,\sigma]^{\rho^2} = 1$ or equivalently $(\sigma^g(\sigma\rho^2))^3 = 1$ holds for all $g \in G$. The group with triality of a group H is (essentially) the wreath product $H \wr \mathrm{Sym}(3)$.

Two loops L_1, L_2 are *isotopic* if there exist bijections $\alpha, \beta, \gamma : L_1 \to L_2$ with $x^\alpha y^\beta = (xy)^\gamma$. Isotopic groups are isomorphic, but this is not true in general for loops or Moufang loops.

A.65. THEOREM (J. I. Hall and G. P. Nagy). *The following are equivalent*

(i) *Groups* (G, S) *with triality and centre* $\zeta(GS) = 1$*;*
(ii) *Latin square designs in which* τ_p *extends to a central automorphism for every point* p*;*
(iii) *Moufang* 3*-nets.*
(iv) *Isotopy classes of Moufang loops.*

In view of Theorems 6.17 and 6.20 we state for comparison the following result [**408**] which parallels Theorem 6.14,

A.66. THEOREM (Nagy and Vojtěchovský). *Let* Q *be a Moufang loop and* $\mathcal{N}$ *be its associated 3-net. Let* G_0 *be the group of collineations generated by the Bol reflections of* $\mathcal{N}$*,* G *the direction preserving part of* $G_0 = G \rtimes S$*, and* $S \cong \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ *the group generated by the Bol reflections whose axis contains the origin of* $\mathcal{N}$*. Then* $\mathrm{Aut}(Q) \cong C_{\mathrm{Aut}(G)}(S)$*.*

Using the correspondence between simple Moufang loops and simple groups with triality that Doro [**181**] and Glauberman [**244**] had discovered, of which by Theorem 6.17 the group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$ is an example, Liebeck proved [**357**] that a finite simple Moufang loop is either associative (and so is a finite simple group), or is isomorphic to a Paige loop [**426**]. In addition to the normed division algebras, the other composition algebras over $\mathbb{R}$, are the split-complex numbers, the split-quaternions and the split-octonions. Let $Oct(K)$ be the eight-dimensional algebra of split-octonions over the field K. Its units form a Moufang loop, and $SOct(K)$ is the subloop of norm-1 octonions. Factoring out the normal subloop $\{\pm 1\}$ of $SOct(K)$ gives a *Paige loop* $PSOct(K)$. A Paige loop is a simple Moufang loop that is isomorphic to all its loop isotopes.

A.67. THEOREM (Grishkov and Zavarnitsine [**259**]). *Every finite Moufang loop* Q *contains a uniquely determined normal series*

$$1 \le \mathrm{Gr}(Q) < Q_0 \le Q$$

such that Q/Q_0 *is an elementary abelian* 2*-group,* $Q_0/\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ *is the direct product of simple Paige loops* $Q(q)$ *(where* q *may vary), the composition factors of* $\mathrm{Gr}(Q)$ *are groups, and* $\mathrm{Gr}(Q/\mathrm{Gr}(Q)) = 1$*.*

For $\mathbb{F}_q$ odd, the Paige loop $PSOct(\mathbb{F}_q)$ has a two-fold extension isomorphic to the loop $PGL(\mathbb{O}(\mathbb{F}_q))$, where $\mathbb{O}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is the Cayley algebra over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Denoting this extension by $Q(\mathbb{F}_q).2$, define

$$\widehat{Q(\mathbb{F}_q)} = \begin{cases} Q(\mathbb{F}_q).2 & \text{if } q \text{ is odd,} \\ Q(\mathbb{F}_q) & \text{if } q \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

The group $\mathrm{InnDiag}(P\Omega^+(8,\mathbb{F}_q))$ of inner-diagonal automorphisms of $P\Omega^+(8,\mathbb{F}_q)$ is a group with triality S corresponding to $\widehat{Q(q)}$, where S is the group of graph automorphisms of $P\Omega^+(8,\mathbb{F}_q)$. Furthermore the factor group

$$\mathrm{InnDiag}(P\Omega^+(8,\mathbb{F}_q))/P\Omega^+(8,\mathbb{F}_q) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } q \text{ is even,} \\ \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 & \text{if } q \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

and in the latter case S acts nontrivially on $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$.

Whilst Doro proved that every Moufang loop can be obtained from a suitable group with triality, in general this group is not uniquely determined by the Moufang loop. In [**258**], Grishkov and Zavarnitsine describe all possible groups associated with a given Moufang loop. They also introduce several universal groups with triality and discuss their properties.

A group G with $S \leq \mathrm{Aut}(G)$ is *S-simple* if the identity and G are the only S-invariant normal subgroups of G. The group G is *triality-simple* if it is S-simple for $S \cong \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ and additionally the group $G.S$ is a group with triality with respect to the conjugacy class containing the transpositions of S.

A *locally finite field* is one that is isomorphic to a subfield of the algebraic closure of a finite field $\mathbb{F}_p$ for some prime p. Liebeck's results were extended to locally finite simple Moufang loops by J. I. Hall [**265**], as follows,

A.68. Theorem. *If G is a nonabelian locally finite triality-simple group, then $G.S$ is one of:*

(a) $N \wr \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ for a nonabelian locally finite simple group N,

(b) $P\Omega^+(8,K) \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ for a locally finite field K.

A.69. Theorem. *A locally finite simple Moufang loop is either associative (and so is a locally finite simple group) or is isomorphic to a Paige loop over a locally finite field.*

This result applies to both finite and infinite groups G.

Hall has a different but equivalent formulation of the theory of groups with triality to that of Doro, in terms of a universal triality group; in [**265**] he proves that a Moufang loop $(Q,\cdot)$ is locally finite if and only if the associated group with triality $\mathrm{Aut}(D(Q,\cdot))^0$ is locally finite. All locally finite fields are countable, and a finite-dimensional

(matrix) algebra over a countable field is countable. This has the corollary [**267**] that an uncountable locally finite simple Moufang loop is associative and so is a locally finite simple group. Also that the octonions and the associated Paige loop over a locally finite field are countable.

There are many Moufang loops related to the 8-dimensional real octonion algebra, for example the multiplicative loop of non-zero elements in $\mathbb{O}$. A nice reference is [**409**]. We can say more. Let M be a Moufang loop with an *isotopy* (with a slightly different but equivalent definition to the one above), that is, a triple of maps $\alpha, \beta, \gamma : M \to M$ such that $x^\alpha y^\beta z^\gamma = 1$ whenever $xyz = 1$. For example, if u is an octonion of norm 1, so that $u^{-1} = \overline{u}$, and with left, right and bi-multiplications given respectively by $L_u(x) = ux$, $R_u(x) = xu$ and bi-multiplication $B_u(x) = uxu$ for every $x \in L$, then it follows from the Moufang law that $(L_u, R_u, B_{\overline{u}})$ is an isotopy. Now if u is purely imaginary of norm 1, then $B_1 B_u$ acts as minus the reflection in u on purely imaginary octonions. These generate $\mathrm{SO}(7)$. Also bi-multiplications do not generally stabilize 1, so they generate at least $SO(8)$. So the group of isotopies is approximately the spin group (double cover of the orthogonal group) with a triality automorphism given by the map $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \mapsto (\beta, \gamma, \alpha)$.

Moufang proved that the loop of units in any alternative algebra satisfies (one of the equivalent forms of) the Moufang identity. Moufang loops, like composition algebras, obey the *alternative laws*

$$(xy)x = x(yx), \qquad x(xy) = x^2 y, \qquad (xy)y = xy^2.$$

Any octonion algebra is alternating, so the units of norm 1 in the split-octonians (over any field) form a Moufang loop.

The connection between Moufang loops and Cartan triality is further illustrated by the following results [**29**]: (a) if $\mathbb{O}^*$ denotes the Moufang loop of all Cayley numbers of norm one and $Z = \{\pm 1\}$ is its centre, then the group generated by all right and left translations of the factor loop $\mathbb{O}^*/Z$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{PSO}(8, \mathbb{R})$ and is closed in the whole homeomorphism group of $\mathbb{O}^*$; (b) the group Δ of all continuous direction-preserving collineations of $\mathbb{O}^*/Z$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{PSO}(8, \mathbb{R})$; the stabilizer Δ_L of Δ on any line L in $\mathcal{N}(Q)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{PSO}(7, \mathbb{R})$. The stabilizer in Δ of every point is isomorphic to the compact exceptional Lie group $G(2)$; (c) the finite simple orthogonal group $P\Omega^+(8, q)$ is the group with triality associated with the finite simple nonassociative Moufang loops [**257**], or $P\Omega^+(8, q) \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ according to [**268**].

Lie Algebras with Triality

This refers to the work of Grishkov [**256**] who defined a *Lie algebra* L *with triality* to be one on which $\mathrm{Sym}(3) = \langle \sigma, \rho : \sigma^2 = 1 = \rho^3, \sigma\rho\sigma = \sigma^2 \rangle$

acts as an automorphism group such that

$$(x^\sigma - x) + (x^\sigma - x)^\rho + (x^\sigma - x)^{\rho^2} = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathsf{L}.$$

This is the additive version of the multiplicative triality identity for groups. Examples include D_4 and any Lie algebra of an algebraic or Lie group with triality. For any Lie algebra L, we can construct the Lie algebra with triality $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{L}) = \mathsf{L}_1 \oplus \mathsf{L}_2 \oplus \mathsf{L}_3$, where L_1, L_2 and L_3 are isomorphic to L has triality where σ transposes L_1 and L_2 and stabilizes L_3, and $\rho \in C_3$. A Lie algebra with triality is *standard* if it is isomorphic to some $\mathsf{T}(\mathsf{L})$ or its invariant subalgebra. An algebra A is perfect if $A^2 = A$. Grishkov proves that a perfect finite-dimensional Lie algebra over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero which has triality is an extension of a Lie algebra with triality of type D_4 by a standard Lie algebra with triality. A Lie algebra L has triality if and only if $\mathsf{L} = \mathsf{L}_0 \oplus \mathsf{L}_2$, where $\mathsf{L}_0 = \{x \in \mathsf{L} : x^\lambda, \forall \lambda \in \mathrm{Sym}(3)$ is $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$-invariant, and L_2 is a sum of irreducible 2-dimensional $\mathrm{Sym}(3)$-modules. A finite or infinite-dimensional simple Lie algebra with triality is of type D_4.

15. Set Theory

We omit introductory discussions of Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, details of which can be found in standard texts such as [**169**] or [**183**]. We need an extension of the following:

Axiom of Foundation. A set contains no infinitely descending membership sequence. (Alternatively, a set contains a membership minimal element).

There are two axioms that are featured in our work:

(a) Axiom of Anti-Foundation. There are many versions of anti-foundation, and rather than give one of the statements or an extensive discussion, it suffices for our purposes to note that it represents a weakening of foundation by allowing the existence of set inclusions of the form $x \in \{x, y\}$ and infinite membership sequences of the form $\ldots \in x_4 \in x_3 \in x_2 \in x_1$. Accounts of anti-founded set theory can be found in [**1**] and [**33**].

The set theory of the binary membership relation ϵ satisfies the Zermelo-Fraenkel axioms. In [**103**] it was observed that first-order set theory can be viewed as the theory of certain special orientations of the random graph. It might be hoped that an analogous proposition would demonstrate that first-order ZFA set theory, this being the Zermelo-Fraenkel axioms with anti-foundation replacing foundation, is the theory of special orientations of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$. However as we will show in

one of the chapters, there is no straightforward extrapolation and that the triality graph *fails* to be a model of ZFA set theory.

A graph can be formed from a (vertex) set $\{x, y, \ldots\}$ by attaching $y \to x$ with an edge if and only if $x \in y$.

A *directed* random graph must allow for four possible directed types of edges:

as well as vertices with loops, regarded as self-adjacencies. The fourth type is disallowed in an *oriented graph* which is a directed graph having no symmetric pair of directed edges. In terms of the set-theoretic construction of $\mathfrak{R}$, symmetrising the binary set-membership relation $\in$ reduces this to *two* possible vertex pairs, edges and non-edges, because again the fourth type is disallowed by the axiom of foundation.

However, if we allow anti-foundation then $\in$ is no longer asymmetric, and we can no longer regard set membership as an oriented graph. The symmetry of $\in$ gives double-edges and its reflexivity permits vertices with loops.

In terms of sentences of first-order logic, we can define the triality graph with loops and directed edges, where the 3 adjacency types are non-edge, edge and double-edge, as the conjunction of an infinite number of first-order sentences of the form:

$$\forall u_1, \ldots, u_p, v_1, \ldots, v_q, w_1, \ldots, w_r \ \exists z, z^l$$

$$\bigcup_{\substack{1\le i\le p\\ 1\le j\le q\\ 1\le k\le r}} (u_i \in z \wedge \neg(z \in u_i)) \vee (z \in u_i \wedge \neg(u_i \in z)) \wedge (\neg(v_j \in z \vee z \in v_j))$$

$$\wedge$$

$$\big(u_i \in z^l \wedge \neg(z^l \in u_i)\big) \vee \big(z^l \in u_i \wedge \neg(u_i \in z^l)\big) \wedge \big(\neg(v_j \in z^l \vee z^l \in v_j)\big)$$

$$\wedge (w_k \in z \wedge z \in w_k) \wedge \big(w_k \in z^l \wedge z^l \in w_k\big) \wedge \neg(z \in z) \wedge (z^l \in z^l).$$

The superscript l denotes loops. Because in the I-property we have equal adjacency status for vertices both with and without a loop, edge-complementation in a graph is independent of loops.

(b) axiom of choice. If C be a collection of nonempty sets, then we can choose a member from each set in that collection. In other words, there exists a function f defined on C with the property that, for each set S in the collection, $f(S)$ is a member of S.

In an appendix to one of the chapters, we build a model of set theory in which the axiom of choice is taken to be false, in particular leading to a modified statement of the Baer–Schreier–Ulam Theorem, as it applies in this model.

An account of permutations and the axiom of choice is given in the article by Truss in [**325**]. The many weaker and stronger versions of the axiom of choice are discussed in the book [**291**] by Howard and Rubin.

16. Number Theory

Quadratic Number fields We give a prologue on quadratic number fields to introduce the terms that we will need in the text.

A reformulation of the law of quadratic reciprocity for quadratic number fields has been influential in the development of L-function theory; it is given by the functional equation

$$\zeta(s)\ L(\chi, s) = \zeta_K(s).$$

The terms are as follows:

$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n\geq 1} n^{-s}$, (integers $s \geq 1$) is the Riemann zeta function;

$L(\chi, s) = \sum_{n\geq 1} \chi(n) n^{-s}$, is the Dirichlet L-function;

$\chi : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a Dirichlet character modulo $q \geq 1$, i.e. a group homomorphism $(\widetilde{\chi}) : (\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^* \to (\mathbb{C})^*$, such that $\chi(x) = (\widetilde{\chi})\ (x \bmod q)$ for $(x, q) = 1$ and $\chi(x) = 0$ if $(x, q) \neq 1$;

$\zeta_K(s) = \sum_{\mathfrak{a}} (N\mathfrak{a})^{-s}$, is the Dirichlet zeta function, (which is the only analogue of $\zeta(s)$ which satisfies the required Euler product);

$K = \mathbb{Q}[(\chi(-1)q)^{\frac{1}{2}}]$ is the quadratic field, so K is imaginary if $\chi(-1) = -1$ and real if $\chi(-1) = 1$;

$\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{O}_K$, denotes non-zero integral ideals in the ring of integers in K. The norm of the ideal is $N\mathfrak{a}$.

In the formula, $\chi \bmod q$ is a non-trivial *primitive* quadratic character of *conductor* q, i.e. there does not exist $\widetilde{q} \mid q$, $\widetilde{q} < q$ and a character of $(\mathbb{Z}/\widetilde{q}\ \mathbb{Z})^*$ such that $\chi(n) = \widetilde{\chi}(n \bmod \widetilde{q})$ for $(n, \widetilde{q}) = 1$. If q is prime, then any non-trivial character is primitive modulo q. The conductor identifies the 'bad' primes and measures how bad they are.

The three types of primes are encapsulated in the Euler product expression

$$\zeta_K(s) = \prod_{p\ split} (1 - p^{-s})^{-2} \prod_{p\ inert} (1 - p^{-2s})^{-1} \prod_{p\ ramified} (1 - p^{-s})^{-1}$$

which is equivalent to the above functional equation with the characterisation

$$\begin{cases} p \text{ is ramified} & \text{iff } \chi(p) = 0 \text{ iff } (p|q) \\ p \text{ is split} & \text{iff } \chi(p) = 1 \text{ iff } (\frac{D}{p}) = 1 \\ p \text{ is inert} & \text{iff } \chi(p) = -1 \text{ iff } (\frac{D}{p}) = -1 \end{cases}$$

where D is the discriminant of K, and the Legendre symbol (a/p) has the value 1 if a is a quadratic residue mod$p$ and -1 if a is a quadratic nonresidue mod$p$, and zero if $p|a$. The terms need explanation. If $\mathfrak{O}$ is the ring of integers of an algebraic number field K, and $\mathfrak{p}$ is a non-zero prime ideal, $\mathfrak{O}/\mathfrak{p}$ is a finite field, so it contains p^f for some rational prime p and some $f > f_{\mathfrak{p}} > 0$. Since $\mathfrak{p} \supset (p)$, let $\mathfrak{p}^e$ be the exact power of $\mathfrak{p}$ dividing (p). A prime with $e_{\mathfrak{p}} > 1$ is called *ramified*.

If number fields $K \supset k$ have respective prime ideals in integer rings $\mathfrak{P} \in \mathfrak{O}$ and $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{o}$ with $\mathfrak{P}$ a prime factor of $\mathfrak{p}$ $(= \mathfrak{P} \cap k)$, the *splitting group* Z is the subgroup of $\mathrm{Gal}(K/k)$ fixing $\mathfrak{P}$. The kernel of the epimorphism $Z \to \mathrm{Gal}((\mathfrak{O}/\mathfrak{P})/(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}))$ is the *inertia group* $T \lhd Z$.

We require the following form of the Chinese Remainder Theorem [**510**, p.12]: let $\mathfrak{a}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{a}_m$ be non-zero pairwise coprime integral ideals and let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m \in \mathfrak{o}$ (a ring of integers). Then $\exists \alpha \in \mathfrak{o}$ such that $\alpha \equiv \alpha_\mu \bmod \mathfrak{a}_\mu (\mu = 1, \ldots, m)$. There is also a generalization of Dirichlet's theorem on primes in arithmetic progression [**510**, p.94]. If q is squarefree and odd, then $\chi(q) = \prod_{p|n} (\frac{n}{p})$ is a unique primitive character modulo q. This is clearly quadratic mod q, and since $p|q > 2$, there are quadratic residues and non-residues mod p, so χ cannot be induced from $q|p$ for any p. Then $\chi(-1) \equiv q \pmod 4$ so $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{q})$ if $q \equiv 1 \pmod 4$ and $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-q})$ if $q \equiv 3 \pmod 4$, with discriminant $D = \chi(q) \cdot q$. Taking q to be prime > 2, gives $\chi(-1) = (-1)^{(q-1)/2}$. Then quadratic reciprocity says that $\left(\frac{-1}{p}\right) = 1$ iff $p \equiv 1(4)$, that $\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) = 1$ iff $p \equiv \pm 1(8)$ and that $\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) = \left(\frac{D}{p}\right) = \left(\frac{(-1)^{(q-1)/2}}{p}\right)\left(\frac{q}{p}\right) = (-1)^{(p-1)(q-1)/4}\left(\frac{q}{p}\right)$.

A similar analysis goes through if q is even.

Cubic Reciprocity

This is a preamble outlining the theory of cubic reciprocity [**302**]. Consider the ring $D = \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$, where $\omega = (-1+\sqrt{-3})/2$, which is a unique factorisation domain and a Euclidean domain. Define the norm of $\alpha = a + b\omega \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ by $N\alpha = \alpha\overline{\alpha} = a^2 - ab + b^2$, where $\overline{\alpha}$ means the complex conjugate of α. Call the primes in $\mathbb{Z}$ rational primes and those in D simply primes (so $7 = (3+\omega)(2-\omega)$ is not prime). Say that an ideal I

is principal if $I = (a)$ for $a \in I$. Then a and b are associate if and only if $(a) = (b)$. Recall the following propositions:

A.70. PROPOSITION. *For all primes $\pi \in D$, there is a rational prime p such that*

$$N\pi = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } \pi \text{ is not associate to a rational prime} \\ p^2 & \text{if } \pi \text{ is associate to } p. \end{cases}$$

A.71. PROPOSITION. *If $\pi \in D$ and $N\pi = p$, a rational prime, then π is a prime in D.*

A.72. PROPOSITION. *Suppose p and q are rational primes. If $q \equiv 2 \pmod 3$, then q is prime in D. If $p \equiv 1 \pmod 3$, then $p = \pi\overline{\pi}$, where π is a prime in D.*

So if q is prime, then $N(q) = q^2 \equiv 1\ (3)$. If $p = \pi\bar{\pi}$, then $N(p) = p^2 = N(\pi)N(\overline{\pi})$ so $N(\pi) = p \equiv 1\ (3)$.

The *units* $\alpha \in D$ (for which $\exists \beta \in D$ such that $\alpha\beta = 1$, or equivalently $N\alpha = 1$) are $\pm 1,\ \pm\omega,\ \pm\omega^2$. The congruence classes modulo a non-zero, nonunit $\gamma \in D$ is called the residue class ring modulo γ, denoted $D/\gamma D$. For a prime π, $D/\pi D$ is a finite field with $N\pi$ elements, so the multiplicative group $(D/\pi D)^*$ has order $N\pi - 1$, and since $\{1,\ \omega,\ \omega^2\} \cong C_3$, it follows that $3 | N\pi - 1$. Most importantly for us, if $\pi \neq 3$, then the residue classes of $1,\ \omega$, and ω^2 are distinct in $D/\pi D$.

Definition If $N\pi \neq 3$, the *cubic residue character* of α modulo π is given by

(a) $\chi_\pi(\alpha) := (\alpha/\pi)_3 = 0$ if $\pi | \alpha$

(b) $\alpha^{(N\pi-1)/3} \equiv (\alpha/\pi)_3 \pmod \pi = 1$ or ω or $\omega^2 \pmod \pi$.

Now $\chi_\pi(\alpha) = 1$ or ω or $\omega^2 \pmod \pi$ by definition and equals 1 *iff* α is a cubic residue.

Definition For a prime $\pi \in D$, π is *primary* if $\pi \equiv 2 \pmod 3$.

Every non-zero element of D has six associates. If $N\pi = p = 1 \pmod 3$, only one of the associates of π is primary, and we may identify the two fields $D/\pi D$ and $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ by mapping the coset of $n \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ to the coset of $n \in D/\pi D$.

The Law of Cubic Reciprocity says that if π_1 and π_2 are primary, and $N\pi_1, N\pi_2 \neq 3$, and $N\pi_1 \neq N\pi_2$, then

$$\chi_{\pi_1}(\pi_2) = \chi_{\pi_2}(\pi_1).$$

This says that π_1 is a cubic residue $(\mathrm{mod}\ \pi_2)$ *iff* π_2 is a cubic residue $(\mathrm{mod}\ \pi_1)$.

APPENDIX B

Diagrams of Algebraic Structures



FIGURE 1. Interrelationship of Algebraic Structures



FIGURE 2. Further Algebraic Interrelationships

APPENDIX C

Diagrams of Graph Types

Let $\mathscr{X}$ be some class of graphs.

Define a graph Γ to be *$\mathscr{X}$-homogeneous* if any isomorphism between induced $\mathscr{X}$-subgraphs of Γ extends to an automorphism of Γ.

Define a graph Γ to be *$\mathscr{X}$-transitive* if whenever A and B are isomorphic $\mathscr{X}$-subgraphs of Γ, there is an automorphism of Γ carrying A to B. Hence transitive is the weaker version of a given homogeneous property.

If Γ is finite, define Γ to be *combinatorially $\mathscr{X}$-homogeneous* if whenever A and B are isomorphic $\mathscr{X}$-subgraphs of Γ then $|N(A)| = |N(B)|$, where $N(x)$ is the set of neighbours of $x \in V(\Gamma)$, and we define $N(X) := \bigcap_{x\in X} N(x)$.

At the end of this section we give a more complete list of definitions. Note that

$\mathscr{X}$-homogeneous $\Rightarrow$ $\mathscr{X}$-transitive $\Rightarrow$ combinatorially $\mathscr{X}$-homogeneous.

If $\mathscr{X}$ is the set of all graphs on at most 5 vertices then for finite graphs combinatorially $\mathscr{X}$-homogeneous $\Rightarrow$ $\mathscr{X}$-homogeneous.

We use *k-homogeneous*, *k-transitive*, and so on if $\mathscr{X}$ is the set of all graphs on at most k vertices. Usually when we use the k-prefix we intend a family of properties rather than a single one.

Example

If $\mathscr{X}$ is the set of connected graphs and $\mathscr{X} \subseteq \mathscr{Y} \Rightarrow \mathscr{Y}$-property $\Rightarrow$ $\mathscr{X}$-property, where 'property' means homogeneous, transitive or combinatorially homogeneous.

We also have for finite graphs that $(k+1)$-CS-homogeneous $\Rightarrow$ $(k+1)$-CS-transitive $\Rightarrow$ k-distance-transitive, or the stronger version CS-homogeneous $\Rightarrow$ CS-transitive $\Rightarrow$ distance-transitive. Further finite graph connections are given in the next two Figures.


5-Homogeneous
Combinatorially 5-Homogeneous
Homogeneous
k-Homogeneous
Combinatorially 5-Homogeneous
Combinatorially Connected-Homogeneous


Homogeneous
k-Homogeneous
Combinatorially k-Homogeneous
Combinatorially Homogeneous

For infinite graphs we have the following:

homogeneous $\Rightarrow \ldots \Rightarrow$ k-homogeneous $\Rightarrow$ $(k-1)$-homogeneous $\Rightarrow \ldots \Rightarrow$ 2-homogeneous $\Rightarrow$ 1-homogeneous (= vertex-transitive).



A distance-regular graph has neither a symmetry nor a distance invariance, but rather a counting condition. Hence,



FIGURE 1. Inclusion relations for some countable graph classes with a counting condition

Some of the relations whose definition we have given are more important than others. Among the more obscure are:-





FIGURE 2. Inclusion relations for some countable graph classes with symmetry or distance invariance showing the centrality of Homogeneity

Definitions

In Figure 2, transitive means transitive on tuples. Also homogeneous means set-transitive; sometimes this is referred to as weakly homogeneous.

(a) A graph is *homogeneous* (respectively *k-homogeneous*) if every isomorphism between finite substructures (respectively on at most k vertices) extends to an automorphism of the entire structure; see Appendix 2.

There is a different concept that was proved to be equivalent to this in [**198**] for finite, simple, undirected graphs; it is defined as follows. For a subset $X \subset V(\Gamma)$, and set of neighbours $N(x)$ of $x \in V(\Gamma)$, define $N(X) = \bigcap_{x \in X} N(x)$. A finite graph is said to be *combinatorially homogeneous* if $|N(X)| = |N(X')|$ for any isomorphic vertex-subgraphs on $X(\Gamma)$ and $X'(\Gamma)$.

(b) A graph is *combinatorially connected-homogeneous* if whenever two subgraphs $X(\Gamma)$ and $X'(\Gamma)$ are connected and isomorphic, then for any subset $Y \backslash X$ there is an isomorphism α of $X(\Gamma)$ onto $X'(\Gamma)$ such that $|N(Y)| = |N(Y^\alpha)|$.

(c) A graph is *metrically homogeneous* if any isometry between finite induced subgraphs extends to an automorphism of the graph;

(d) A graph is *metrically k-homogeneous* if any isometry between k-element induced subgraphs extends to an automorphism of the graph;

(e) A graph is *locally homogeneous* if any automorphism of induced subgraphs of the graph extends to an automorphism of the graph. A variation is that a graph is *locally P-homogeneous* if any automorphism of induced subgraphs of the graph that lie in P extends to an automorphism of the graph;

(f) A graph is *XY-transitive* if every x-morphism between finite subgraphs X and Y can be extended to a y-morphism from the graph to itself, where (X, x) and (Y, y) can be (I, iso), (M, mono), or (H, homo). There are six properties of this kind that can be considered: HH, MH, IH, MM, IM, and II. Property II is equivalent to the standard notion of homogeneity.

(g) A graph is called *k-arc-transitive* for a positive integer k, if it has a walk of length k with specified initial point in which no line succeeds itself, and if there is always a graph automorphism of sending each k-arc onto any other k-arc. Note that

1-arc-transitive is equivalent to *symmetric*; a graph is symmetric if, for all vertices u, v, x, y of Γ, such that $u \sim v$ and $x \sim y$ are adjacent, there exists $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ satisfying $g(u) = x$ and $g(v) = y$. Note also that

distance-transitive $\Rightarrow$ symmetric $\Rightarrow$ vertex-transitive.

Furthermore 2-arc-transitive implies triangle-free.

(h) A graph is *connected-homogeneous* if any isomorphism between connected finite induced subgraphs extends to an automorphism of the graph;

(i) A graph is *distance transitive* if, given any vertices u, v, u', v' such that $d(u, v) = d(u', v')$, there is an $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ such that $\alpha(u) = u'$ and $\alpha(v) = v'$. Note that distance transitive is equivalent to metrically 2-homogeneous and a homogeneous graph is a distance-transitive graph with distance at most 2;

(j) A graph is *locally k-distance transitive* if the stabilizer of a vertex v acts transitively on the set of vertices at distance 1 from v and on the set of vertices at distance k from v [**168**]. If the graph is also vertex-transitive then it is said to be k-distance transitive;

(k) A graph is *k-CS-transitive*, for a positive integer k, if for any two connected isomorphic induced subgraphs A, B of Γ, each of size k, there is an automorphism of Γ taking A to B;

(l) A graph is called *k-CS-homogeneous* if any isomorphism between two connected induced subgraphs of size k extends to an automorphism;

(m) A regular connected graph is *distance-regular* if, (a) for each vertex u the distance partition ∂_u of Γ relative to u is equitable, and (b) the quotient $\Gamma \backslash \partial_u$ is independent of u;

(n) A graph with diameter d is *distance degree regular* if, the number of vertices at a distance i from a given vertex depends only on i;

(o) A connected graph with diameter d and function $F : \{1, \ldots, d\} \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ is *F-geodesic* if, given any pair of vertices at a distance i from each other have exactly $F(i)$ shortest paths joining them. If $F(i) = 1$ for all i, then Γ is called *geodetic*.

APPENDIX D

Some Separation Axioms for Topological Spaces

Two subsets (or points) in a topological space X are *topologically distinguishable* if at least one of them has a neighbourhood that is not a neighbourhood of the other. They are *separated* if each of them has a neighbourhood that is not a neighbourhood of the other; that is, neither belongs to the closure of the other.

We list a few of the restrictions that can be imposed on a topological space in order of increasing strength, though there are varying definitions in the literature.

• A topological space is a T_0 *space* if one point out of any two distinct points has a neighbourhood which does not contain the other point, that is they are topologically distinguishable.

• A topological space is an R_0 *space* if any two topologically distinguishable points are separated.

• A topological space is a T_1 *space* if any two distinct points are separated. A space is T_1 if and only if it is both T_0 and R_0.

• A topological space is an R_1 *space* if any two topologically distinguishable points are separated by neighbourhoods, that is have disjoint neighbourhoods. An R_1 space must also be R_0.

• A topological space is a *Hausdorff space* (or a T_2 *space*) if any two distinct points have disjoint neighbourhoods which do not contain the other point. A space is T_2 if and only if it is both T_0 and R_1.

• A space is called a *regular space* if whenever S is a closed set and x is a point which is not in S then there are disjoint open sets U and V such that $x \in U$ and $S \subset V$, that is they are separated by neighbourhoods. (There are also closed neighbourhoods that separate.) A regular T_0 space is called a T_3 *space*.

• A space is called a *normal space* if any two disjoint closed subsets of X are separated by neighbourhoods. A normal T_1-space is called a T_4 *space*.

For a topological space we have the implications

$$T_4 \Rightarrow T_3 \Rightarrow T_2 \Rightarrow T_1 \Rightarrow T_0.$$

The T_0 axiom can not only be added to a property, but also subtracted from a property. An example of a regular space that is neither T_1 nor

T_2 is the indiscrete topology $(X, \{\varnothing, X\})$. A regular space where all singletons are closed is T_2.

APPENDIX E

Tables

Groups	Notation	Chapter No.
1. Random Bipartite Graph Groups with vertex colours	$G(\mathfrak{B}^v)$	2
2. Multicoloured Switching Groups and Duality Groups (and Variations)	$S_{m,n}$ $D_{m,n}$	2
3. Finitary Switching Group	$S^f_{m,\omega}$	3
4. Enhanced Switching Group	$ES_{m,\omega}$	3
5. Closure of Switching Group	$S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$	3
6. Coloured Tsaranov Group	$\mathrm{Ts}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$	4
7. Coloured Coxeter Group	$\mathrm{Cox}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$	4
8. Group of Equivalence Classes of Equivalence Relation on $\mathrm{NB}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$	$\mathrm{NS}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$	7
9. Group of Equivalence Classes of Near-Automorphisms $\mathrm{NA}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$	$\mathrm{NE}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$	7
10. Zero Vertex Index Group	$\mathrm{Aut}_0(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$	7
11. Finite Vertex Index Group	$\mathrm{Aut}_{fin}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$	7
12. Automorphism Group of Filters on $\mathfrak{R}$	$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{R}})$	8
13. Group of Auto-homeomorphisms of $\mathcal{T}$ Topology	$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T})$	8
14. Group of Auto-homeomorphisms of $\mathcal{T}^*$ Topology	$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}^*)$	8
15. Group of Auto-homeomorphisms of $\mathcal{T}^\dagger$ Bipartite Graph Topology	$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T}^\dagger)$	8
16. Group of Automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$-uniform hypergraph $\mathfrak{RHyp}$	$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{RHyp})$	8
17. Group of Almost Automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}$-uniform hypergraph $\mathfrak{RHyp}$	$\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{RHyp})$	8

FIGURE 1. Table of Some Groups Arising

$S_{2,n} \cong (C_2)^{n-1}$	$S_{m,n} \cong (\mathrm{Alt}(m))^{n(n-1)/2} \rtimes (C_2)^{n-1}$
$\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ *is a reduct*	$\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ *are not reducts*
$S_{2,n}$ *has many switching classes*	$S_{m,n}$ *is transitive on* $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$
$\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ *reducts are 2–transitive*	$\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,n})$ *reducts are highly transitive*
$G^W_{2,n}$ *is not even transitive on* $\mathcal{G}_{2,n}$	$G^W_{m,n}$ *acts primitively on* $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$
$S^*_{2,n}$ *is not even transitive on* $\mathcal{G}_{2,n}$	$S^*_{m,n}$ *acts primitively on* $\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$
$S_{2,n}$ *has no transitive extension*	$S_{m,n}$ *weakly transitively extends*
$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R})$ *is three – star transitive*	$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ *is not three – star transitive*
$\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ *is generously 2–transitive*	$\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ *is not generously 2–transitive*
$\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R})$ *is 2–transitive*	$\mathrm{SAut}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$ *are highly transitive*
There is no polynomial algebra Galois Correspondence	$H \leq \mathrm{Sym}(m-1) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{A}^{D^H_{m,\omega}}$
$\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{R}_{2,\omega})^{H_r}$ *is polynomial algebra*	$\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})^{H_r}$ *not polynomial algebra*
The proportion of switching classes of $2-$*colour graphs with* n *vertices which have non – trivial automorphisms* $\to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$	*The proportion of switching classes of* $m-$*colour graphs with* n *vertices which have non – trivial automorphisms* $\to \infty$ *as* n *to* ∞

FIGURE 2. Table of Differences between $\mathfrak{R}$ and $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ $(m \geq 3)$

$\mathrm{Sym}(n)$	B_n
$s_i^2 = (i\ i+1)^2 = 1 (i = 1, \ldots, n-1)$	$b_i\ (i = 1, \ldots, n-2)$
$s_i s_j = s_j s_i$ if $\lvert i-j \rvert \geq 2$	$b_i b_j = b_j b_i$ if $\lvert i-j \rvert \geq 2$
$s_i s_{i+1} s_i = s_{i+1} s_i s_{i+1}$	$b_i b_{i+1} b_i = b_{i+1} b_i b_{i+1}$
$\mathrm{Hyp}(n)$	$S_{m,n}$
$h_i^2 = 1\ (i = 0, \ldots, n-1)$	$\sigma_{i,j}^2 = 1 (1 \leq i \neq j \leq m)$
$h_i h_j = h_j h_i$ if $\lvert i-j \rvert > 1$	$\sigma_{i,j}\sigma_{i,k} = \sigma_{j,k} = \sigma_{i,k}\sigma_{i,j}$
$h_i h_{i+1} h_i = h_{i+1} h_i h_{i+1}\ (i \geq 1)$ $(i \geq 1)$	$\sigma_{i,j}\sigma_{k,l}\sigma_{i,j} = \sigma_{k,l}\sigma_{i,j}\sigma_{k,l}$ $\lvert i-j \rvert, \lvert k-l \rvert \geq 2$
$h_1 h_0 h_1 h_0 = h_0 h_1 h_0 h_1$	

FIGURE 3. Presentations of $\mathrm{Sym}(n)$, B_n, $\mathrm{Hyp}(n)$, $S_{m,n}$

APPENDIX F

Quotations

In this section we give some quotations that underlie the philosophy behind the Further Directions chapter.

If man were restricted to collecting facts the sciences were only a sterile nomenclature and he would never have known the great laws of nature. It is in comparing the phenomena with each other, in seeking to grasp their relationships, that he is led to discover these laws...

Pierre-Simon Laplace

He who wants to unlock secrets should not lock himself away in one area of science, but should maintain connections with its other areas as well.

J. Hadamard

the mathematical facts worthy of being studied are those which, by their analogy with other facts, are capable of leading us to the knowledge of a mathematical law, just as experimental facts lead us to the knowledge of a physical law. They are those which reveal to us unsuspected kinship between other facts, long known, but wrongly believed to be strangers to one another.

H. Poincaré

In proportion as science develops, its total comprehension becomes more difficult; then we seek to cut it in pieces and to be satisfied with one of these pieces: in a word, to specialize. If we went on in this way, it would be a grievous obstacle to the progress of science. As we have said, it is by unexpected union between its diverse parts that it progresses.

H. Poincaré

Mathematics, physics, chemistry, astronomy, march in one front. Whichever lags behind is drawn after.

K. Schwarzschild

As every mathematician knows, nothing is more fruitful than these obscure analogies, these indistinct reflections of one theory into another, these furtive caresses, these inexplicable disagreements; also nothing gives the researcher greater pleasure.

A. Weil

I think chance is a more fundamental conception than causality

Max Born, *Natural Philosophy of Cause and Chance*, (1948).

I don't want to belong to any club that will accept me as a member.

Groucho Marx, *Groucho and me. An autobiography.* (1959), 320.

Technical skill is mastery of complexity while creativity is mastery of simplicity. Catastrophe Theory, 1977.

E. C. Zeeman, *Catastrophe Theory*, (1977).

– that's the beauty of pure mathematics – one is always discovering new connections between things that looked unconnected.

F. J. Dyson

The same pathological structures that the mathematicians invented to break loose from 19th–century naturalism turn out to be inherent in familiar objects all around us in Nature.

F. J. Dyson, *Characterizing Irregularity*, Science 200 (1978), 677-8.

Putting together widely differing facts drawn either from the experimental sciences or from within mathematics itself is one of the essential ingredients of mathematics. We must have people who try to connect up different parts of mathematics as well as those who restrict themselves to one area and try to get as far as possible in that direction.

M. Atiyah

The experience of past centuries shows that the development of mathematics was due not to technical progress (consuming most of the efforts of mathematicians at any given moment), but rather to discoveries of unexpected interrelations between different domains (which were made possible by these efforts). ... Growing specialisation and bureaucratic subdivision of mathematics into small domains becomes an obstacle to its development ... This lack of understanding of the interrelations between different domains of mathematics originates from the disasterous divorce of mathematics from physics in the middle of the 20th century, and from the resulting degeometrisation of mathematical education.

V. I. Arnold

But, to be sure, this tendency is a manifestation of the unity of mathematics and, equally evidently, its emergence was a direct or indirect effect of theoretical physics. In fact, in the second half of the XXth Century it began to swing sideways *away from analysis and the linear equations of mathematial physics towards algebra (including algebraic geometry) and towards probability*, whereupon the special role of probability theoretical constructions in modern theoretical physics, and, above all, in statistical physics and quantum-field theory became undeniable. ... We have in mind the fact that when one studies, for example, symmetric groups of large degree or Lie groups of large rank, one encounters the same phenomenon as the Law of Large Numbers in probability theory, although, a priori, the formulation of the problem did not involve any probability! ... Here, the similarity to the Law of Large Numbers is not an approximate analogy, but a completely precise fact[.] ... the study of random algebraic systems are of particular interest. ... General trends in the development of mathematics are determined not only, and even not so often, by major problems remaining from the past; it has become commonplace to speak about the role of Hilbert's problems in the development of XXth Century mathematics. Internal trends play a much more substantial role, together with the internal logic of the development of the science, which is determined not only by unsolved problems, however attractive they might appear, but by the interweaving of the interests, methods and applications of different areas. However, to attempt to predict these trends at a remote date is almost hopeless.

A. M. Vershik

It is also vital to always keep moving. The risk otherwise is to confine oneself in a relatively small area of extreme technical specialization, thus shrinking one's perception of the mathematical world and its bewildering diversity. ... In other words there is just "one" mathematical world, whose exploration is the task of all mathematicians, and they are all in the same boat somehow.

A. Connes

The thing that *doesn't* fit, is the thing that is most interesting. The part that *doesn't* go according to what you would expect.

R. Feynman

Be prepared to consider crazy ideas, radical ideas ... it doesn't follow that every crazy idea is a good one, but some crazy ideas are good ones and you want to think carefully before discarding them entirely.

M. Atiyah

Glossary of Notation

The page or chapter number refers to the first (or only) occurrence of the notation. We often exclude notation that is used only within a short proof, example or paragraph. Greek letter entries are at the end.

$a(n)$	exponential generating function	Appendix 12
a_n	number of labeled structures on an n-element set	Appendix 12
$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{M})$	age of a relational structure $\mathcal{M}$	Chapter 5
Age(M)	age of a relational structure M	Appendix 4
$\mathcal{A}$	polynomial algebra	Appendix A, Chapter 5
$\mathcal{A}^G$	algebra of $\mathcal{A}$-fixed points	Appendix A, Chapter 5
$\mathrm{Alt}(\Omega)$	alternating group of permutations on the set Ω	throughout
Aut	automorphism group	Page 3
AAut	group of almost automorphisms	throughout
$\mathrm{Aut}^H(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$	group of vertex-permutations inducing colour-permutations H	Page 17
$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}_{\mathfrak{i}})$	automorphism group of $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ but colourblind in $\mathfrak{i}$ and another colour	Page 22
$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q},\leq)$	group of all order preserving automorphisms of $\mathbb{Q}$	Page 249
$\mathrm{Aut}^*(\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega})$	group of all automorphisms of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$	Page 160
Aut_0	zero vertex index group	Page 169
Aut_{fin}	finite vertex index group	Page 169
$AGL(V)$	affine general linear group	Page 38
$b(n)$	generating function	Appendix 12
b_n	number of isomorphism classes of structures of size n	Appendix 9
$\mathcal{B}$	base of open subgroups of group	Appendix 10
$\mathcal{B}(X)$	Borel subsets of X	Appendix 3
$B(x,r)$	open ball of radius r centred at x	Appendix 10
$\mathbb{B}$	Boolean algebra	Page 182

$\mathrm{BAut}(\Gamma)$	group of biggest automorphisms of Γ	Page 14
$\mathfrak{B}$	random bipartite graph	Page 23
$\mathfrak{B}^*$	bipartite complement of $\mathfrak{B}^*$	Page 24
B_m	Braid group	Page 89
$\mathcal{B}_c$	set of n-vertex complete bipartite graphs	Page 28
$\mathrm{BSym}_\alpha(\Omega)$	group of all permutations moving fewer than α points for each infinite cardinal $\alpha \leq \lvert\Omega\rvert$	Page 240
$\mathbb{C}$	field of complex numbers	throughout
$c(x, y)$	colour of the edge between vertices x and y	Page 17
Cr	cartesian product of groups	Page 59
Co	Conway group	Page 132
Cox	Coxeter group	Page 83
Cox^+	even part of Coxeter group	Page 83
CA	Clifford algebra	Chapter 11, Appendix 13
CG	Clifford group	Appendix 13
CG_0^+	Reduced Clifford group	Appendix 13
$Cay(G, S)$	Cayley graph on G	Appendix 1
$\mathcal{C}_2$	2-dimensional simplicial complex	Page 42
$\mathcal{C}$	set of induced cycles in (Γ, f)	Page 73
$\mathcal{C}$	set of edge colours	Page 160
$\mathcal{C}_m$	set of m edge colours	throughout
$char(K)$	characteristic of field K	throughout
$\mathrm{card}(A)$	cardinality of a set A	Page 309
$\mathrm{Comm}_G(H)$	commensurability subgroup of $H < G$	Page 284
D	Latin square design	Appendix 14
$d(x, y)$	distance between x and y	throughout
$\dim(\cdot)$	dimension	throughout
$\mathrm{dom}(f)$	domain of a map f	throughout
diag	diagonal matrix	Page 273
$\mathrm{diam}(\Gamma)$	denotes the diameter of graph Γ	Page 345
$\mathrm{DAut}(\Gamma)$	duality automorphism group of Γ	Page 14
Dr	direct product of groups	Page 63
$E(\Gamma)$	edge set of graph Γ	throughout
$E = E(\Gamma, f)$	adjacency matrix of signed graph	Page 70
e_n	number of Euler graphs on n-vertex graphs	Page 12

e	edge set of graph	Page 58
$\mathbb{F}, GF(q)$	finite fields	throughout
f, ϕ	functions	throughout
f_m	colouring function on edges of $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$	Page 49
f_X	signed switching class	Page 69
$F(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$	n-ary function symbol	Appendix 2
$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$	polynomial	Appendix 11
$\mathscr{F}$	filter	throughout
$\mathscr{F}_c$	cofinite filter	throughout
$\mathscr{F}_\Gamma$	neighbourhood filter on graph Γ	Chapter 8
$\mathcal{F}(X)$	field or σ-algebra on a space X	Appendix 3
$\mathrm{FSym}(\Omega)$	finitary symmetric group of permutations on the set Ω	throughout
fix	fixed points of group action	Chapter 6
G	group	throughout
$G_{\{\Delta\}}$	setwise stabilizer of permutation group	throughout
$G_{(\Delta)}$	pointwise stabilizer of permutation group	throughout
$G_{\bar{\mu}}$	stabilizer of tuple	throughout
(G, Ω)	permutation group G on a set Ω	Appendix 1
g_n	sequence of group elements	throughout
$\mathcal{G}_{m,n}$	set of simple complete n-vertex m-edge graphs	Page 9
$\tilde{G}$	Markov chain whose states are graphs	Appendix 9
$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$	set of all graph processes	Appendix 9
G^{cl}	closure of group G	Page 15
$G^W_{m,n}$	extended switching groups	Page xxii
G_0	amorphous set gauge group	Chapter F
$\mathfrak{i}G(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$	group acting on $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ stabilizing colour $\mathfrak{i}$	Page 22
$3G(\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}})$	group acting on $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ preceded by action of C_3	Page 22
$[G, G]$	commutator subgroup of G derived group of G	Page 43
Gal	Galois group	Appendix 16
(G, S)	group with triality	Page 387
$G(M)$	group generated by L(x) & R(x)	Page 387
ɔ	modular group	Page 121

$HOL(G)$	holomorph of a group G	Appendix 1
Hx	coset space; set of right cosets of H in G	Chapter 2
$H(\mathbb{Q})$	autohomeomorphism group of $\mathbb{Q}$	Page 179
$\mathfrak{H}_k$	homogeneous universal K_k-free graph	Page 32
$\mathfrak{h}_3(\mathbb{O})$	exceptional Jordan algebra	Appendix 13
$H^1(\mathcal{C}_2, \mathbb{Z}_2)$	cohomology group	Page 42
$\mathrm{Hyp}(n)$	Hyperoctahedral group	Page 272
$\mathcal{H}_\omega$	direct limit of hypercubes	Page 287
$\mathcal{H}$	completion of $\mathcal{H}_\omega$	Page 287
Hom	vector space homomorphism	Page 370
homo	number of graph homomorphisms	Page 352
$\mathcal{I}$	index set	Appendix 3
$I(Q)$	two-sided ideal	Appendix 13
$\mathrm{im}(f)$	image of a map f	Page 67
$\mathrm{ind}(f)$	index of a map f	Page 166
$\mathrm{Inn}(\cdot)$	group of inner automorphisms	Page 161
J	rim of signed graph	Page 75
j	quadratic form	Appendix 13
J	order 3 mapping	Appendix 13
K	field	throughout
$K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$	polynomial algebra in n variables over field K	throughout
$K[V]$	finite-dimensional K-vector space	throughout
$K[V]^G$	ring of invariants of K-vector space under G-action	throughout
$K[G]$	group ring	throughout
K_k	complete graph on k vertices	Page 32
$\ker(\cdot)$	kernel of a map or permutation	throughout
L	first-order language	Appendix 2
L	loop	Page 383
$L(x)$	left-acting bijection on a loop element x	Page 385
$\mathrm{LMlt}(Q)$	Left bijections on a Moufang loop Q	Page 150
$\mathbb{L}$	lattice	Page 129
$\mathbb{L}_{E_8}$	root lattice of the E_8 Lie algebra	throughout
$\mathbb{L}_L(\mathbb{L}_L^{\mathbb{C}})$	(complex) Leech lattice	throughout
$\mathcal{L}$	3-net	Appendix 14

L	Lie algebra	Page 277
$M, \mathcal{M}$	a structure	throughout
$\mathcal{M}(X)$	set of Borel measures on X	Appendix 3
M_n	random structure of size n	Appendix 2
M_s	domain of a structure	Appendix 2
$(M, b)_{b\in B}$	expanded structure	Appendix 2
$M_{2^n\times 2^n}(\mathbb{R})$	a space of matrices	Appendix 13
$\mathbb{M}$	Fischer-Griess Monster group	throughout
$\mathrm{Mlt}(Q)$	multiplication group of a Moufang loop Q	Page 151
$\mathbb{N}$	commutative monoid of natural numbers	throughout
$N(g)$	vertex index of element g	Page 169
$N(v)$	neighbours of vertex v	Page 170
$N(U)$	neighbourhood set for a finite vertex set U	Page 183
$\mathfrak{N}$	Covington graph	Page 34
$\mathbf{N}$	class of N-free graphs	Page 34
$\mathbf{N}_f$	class of finite N-free graphs	Page 34
$\mathcal{N}$	permutation model	Chapter
$\mathrm{Nuc}(\,Q)$	nucleus of a Moufang loop Q	Page 386
$\mathrm{NB}(\Omega)$	group of near bijections of a set Ω	Page 165
$\mathrm{NS}(\Omega)$	group of near symmetries of a set Ω	Page 165
$NA(\Gamma)$	group of near automorphisms of a graph Γ	Page 166
$NE(\Gamma)$	group of equivalence classes of elements of $\mathrm{NA}(\Gamma)$	Page 166
$\mathbb{O}$	nonassociative normed division algebra of octonions	throughout
O, O_i	open sets	Appendices 3
$\mathbb{OP}^2$	Moufang projective plane	Appendix 13
$O(n, K)$	n-dimensional orthogonal group over field K	throughout
$O(\infty)$	direct limit of orthogonal groups $O(n)$	Appendix 13
$\mathfrak{O}$	point at infinity	Page 100
$\mathrm{Out}(\Gamma)$	group of outer automorphisms of Γ	Page 161
$Pr(\sigma)$	$\lim_{n\to\infty} Pr_n(\sigma)$	Appendix 9
$\mathbf{P}^1(K)$	projective line over a field K	Page 283
$Pr_n(\sigma)$	probability sentence σ is true in M_n	Appendix 9

P	parity on a complete 3-coloured graph	Page 66
P_m	parity on an m-coloured graph generalizing P parity	Page 55
P_m	parity on class of complete m-coloured graphs	Page 66
$\mathcal{P}$	property	throughout
p	finite partial bijection from $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$ to $\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$	Page 49
p	part of a partition	Page 299
$\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$	power set of Ω	throughout
PSL	projective special linear group	throughout
PSO	projective special orthogonal group	throughout
$\mathbb{Q}$	field of rational numbers	throughout
$\mathbb{Q}[i]$	Gaussian algebraic number field	throughout
q	quadratic form	Appendix 13
Q	Moufang loop	Page 385
q	size of Hamming space alphabet	Page 287
$\mathbb{R}$	field of real numbers	throughout
$\mathbb{R}\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$	free $\mathbb{R}$-algebra	Appendix 13
$r(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$	n-ary relation symbol	Appendix 2
$R(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$	n-ary relation symbol	Appendix 2
$\mathfrak{R}$	2 edge-colour countably infinite random graph	Page 1
$\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$	triality graph, 3 edge-colour countably infinite random graph	Page 2
$\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g}$	red, blue and green triality graph edge colours	throughout
$\mathfrak{R}_{m,\omega}$	m-colour countably infinite random graph	Page 4
$\mathfrak{R}^v$	random graph with coloured vertices	Page 29
r_n	proportion of n-vertex graphs with specified property	Appendix 9
$R(x)$	right-acting bijection on a loop	Page 385
R_k	relations in Γ	Page 23
range(f)	range of a map f	throughout
$\mathfrak{R}_N$	universal graph of fixed finite diameter N	Page 232

$\mathrm{RMlt}(Q)$	Right bijections on a Moufang loop Q	Page 150
S	a generating set for $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$	Appendix 1
S	a structure	Appendix 2
S	spinor space of CA	Appendix 13
S	switching parity on a complete 3-coloured graph	Page 41
S	subset of $\mathbb{N}$	Page 116
$S^{\pm}$	half-spin representations of $\mathfrak{so}(n,\mathbb{R})$	Appendix 13
$\mathcal{S}$	a set of graph paths	Appendix 4
$\mathcal{S}_\omega$	group inducing finitary edge-colour permutations	Chapter 3
$\mathcal{S}(U,V)$	set of graphs satisfying $(*)$	Appendix 9
$S_{m,n}$	switching group	Page 10
$S^{cl}_{m,\omega}$	closure of $S_{m,\omega}$	Page 62
$\mathrm{soc}(G)$	socle of a group G	Appendix 1, Chapter 11
Spin	spin group	throughout
$\mathrm{SAut}(\Gamma)$	group of switching automorphisms of Γ	Page 10
$\sqrt{a}$	a square-root set in a group	Appendix 1, Chapter 6
$\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega)$	symmetric group of permutations on the set Ω	throughout
S_n	group of switchings on $\mathfrak{R}_{m,n}$ as products of elementary switchings	Page 67
Suz	Suzuki group	Page 132
t_i	a term	Appendix 2
T	theory	Appendix 2
T	topology	Appendix 10
$T(V)$	tensor algebra	Appendix 13
$\mathrm{Th}(M)$	theory of a structure M	Appendix 2
$\mathrm{Th}(M,a)_{a\in M}$	type over a model M	throughout
$\mathrm{tp}_M(\bar{a})$	type of $\bar{a} \in M^k_s$	Appendix 2
$\mathrm{tp}_M(\bar{a}/B)$	type of $\bar{a}$ in $(M,b)_{b\in B}$	Appendix 2
$\mathcal{T}(\Gamma)$	two-graph of Γ	Page 11
t_n	number of switching classes for n-vertex graphs	Page 12
$\mathrm{TAut}(\Gamma)$	group of all automorphisms of Γ	Page 160
$T_d(X)$	natural topology	Appendix 10
Ts	Tsaranov group	Page 83

(T, r)	rooted tree	Page 85
$\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}^*, \mathcal{T}^\dagger$	topologies on $\mathfrak{R}$	Page 184
$t(\gamma, \Gamma)$	graph homomorphism density	Page 352
U, V	finite disjoint sets of vertices in $\mathfrak{R}$	throughout
U, V, W	finite disjoint sets of vertices in $\mathfrak{R}^{\mathfrak{t}}$	throughout
U	amorphous set	Chapter 8
$\mathcal{U}$	topology on $\mathfrak{R}$	Page 186
V_n	nth homogeneous component of vector space	Appendix 11
V^*	dual vector space	throughout
$V(\Gamma)$	vertex set of graph Γ	throughout
v	vertex in $V(\Gamma)$	throughout
$v^{\mathfrak{i}}$	vertex with colour $\mathfrak{i}$	Chapters 1, 2
$V^\natural$	Monster module	throughout
W_i	unary relation	Appendix 9, Page 237
$\mathrm{W}(\Gamma, f)$	Weyl group of root lattice $\mathbb{L}(\Gamma, f)$	Page 69
$W_{\mathbb{L}_{E_8}}$	Weyl group of the E_8 Lie algebra	throughout
X	set	throughout
x_i	elements of a set	throughout
X	a space	Appendix 3
(X, d)	metric space	throughout
(X, T)	topological space	Appendix 3
$(X, T_d(X))$	topological space	Appendix 3
$(X, \mathcal{F}(X), \mu)$	probability space	Appendix 3
$\mathcal{Y}(M)$	a set of paths in a structure M	Appendix 4
$\mathbb{Z}$	ring of integers	throughout
$\mathbb{Z}_p$	ring of integers modulo p	throughout
$\mathbb{Z}[\omega]$	ring of Eisenstein integers	Appendix 13, Chapter 6

α	main anti-automorphism of CA	Appendix 13
β	automorphism or almost automorphism	Chapter 6
Γ_C	countable universal homogeneous C-coloured graph	Page 342
(Γ, f)	signed graph	Page 69
$\Gamma(n,p)$	random graph on n vertices with connection probability p	Appendix 9
$\Gamma(S), \Gamma(G)$	Cayley graphs	Chapter 6
$[\Gamma(G)]^2$	2-complex of Cayley graph	Page 127
γ	first invariant of $\mathcal{T}(\Gamma)$	Page 82
$\triangle$	symmetric difference	throughout
Δ_1, Δ_2	bipartite blocks of $\mathfrak{B}$	Page 24
$\zeta(\cdot)$	centre of a group or loop	throughout
θ	homomorphism (variously iso- mono- & epimorphism)	throughout
Θ	theta function	Page 134
ι	inclusion map	Page 56
ι_i	interpretations of structure of M in N	Page 361
κ	uncountable cardinal	Page 336
Λ	lattice or projective class of lattices	Page 277
Λ	ordered abelian group	Page 290
μ, ν	measures of a set	Appendix 3
ξ	switching operation	Page 10
π	permutation	Page 59
π	set partition	Page 99, Appendix 1
ρ	representation homomorphism	Appendix 13
ρ_s	spinor representation	Appendix 13
ρ	3-cycle of Group with Triality	Chapter 6 §4-5
$\sigma, \sigma_i, \sigma'$	cyclic automorphisms	Chapter 6 §1
σ	2-cycle of Group with Triality	Chapter 6 §4-5
σ	a sentence	Appendix 2
Σ	set of sentences	Appendix 2
$\sigma_{c,d,Y}$	switching operation on graph Y of edge-colours c & d	Page 9

σ	isometry	Chapter 10
τ	3-cycle (automorphism)	Page 122
τ_C	Cartan triality 3-cycle	Page 122
τ_x	partial automorphism	Appendix 14
τ_{CA}	triality outer automorphism of $P\Omega^+(8,\mathbb{R})$	Appendix 13
ϕ_M	profile of relational structure M	Appendix 11
$\Phi(g)$	triality identity for $g \in G$	Page 142
Υ	SML graph	Page 79
$\chi_{\pi_1}(\pi_2)$	cubic residue character of π_2 modulo π_1	Appendix 16
Ψ_k	axiom resembling the k-e.c. property	Appendix 9
ω	cube root of unity	Chapter 6
Ω	a set	throughout
Ω^k	k-tuple of elements from a set Ω	throughout
$\Omega^+(8,\mathbb{R})$	Reduced orthogonal group, commutator subgroup of $O^+(8,\mathbb{R})$	Appendix 13

Bibliography

[1] P. Aczel, *Non-well-founded Sets*, CSLI Lecture Notes, 14, Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1988.

[2] J. F. Adams, Spin(8), *triality, F_4 and all that*, in *Superspace and Supergravity*, edited by S. W. Hawking and M. Rocek. Proceedings of the Nuffield Workshop, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981.

[3] J. F. Adams, *Lectures on Exceptional Lie Groups*, edited by Z. Mahmud and M. Mimira, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1996.

[4] G. Ahlbrandt and M. Ziegler, *Quasi-finitely axiomatizable totally categorical theories*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic, 30, 63-82, 1986.

[5] E. Al-Aamily, A. O. Morris and M. H. Peel, *The representations of the Weyl groups of type B_n*, J. Algebra 68, 298-305, 1981.

[6] M. H. Albert, *Measures on the random graph*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 50, 417-429, 1994.

[7] R. Albert and A-L. Barabási, *Statistical mechanics of complex networks*, Reviews of Modern Physics 74, 47-97, 2002.

[8] M. O. Albertson and K. L. Collins, *Symmetry breaking in graphs*, Electron. J. Combin. 3, 1, Research paper R18, 1996.

[9] H. Albuquerque, and S. Majid, *Quasialgebra structure of the octonions*, J. Algebra 220, No.1, 188-224, 1999.

[10] P. P. Alejandro, R. A. Bailey and P. J. Cameron, *Association schemes and permutation groups*, Discrete Math. 266, No.1-3, 47-67, 2003.

[11] N. Alon and T. H. Marshall, *Homomorphisms of edge-coloured graphs and Coxeter groups*, J. Algebr. Comb. 8, No.1, 5-13, 1998.

[12] N. Alon and J. E. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2000.

[13] J. L. Alperin, J. Covington and D. Macpherson, *Automorphisms of quotients of symmetric groups*, in *Ordered Groups and Infinite Permutation Groups*, edited by Holland, W.Charles, Mathematics and its Applications (Dordrecht), vol. 354, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1996.

[14] D. J. Aldous, "Continuum limits of discrete random structures", Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Hyderabad, India, 2010.

[15] F. Antonsen, *Random graphs as a model for pregeometry*, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 33, No.6, 1189-1205, 1994.

[16] V. I. Arnold, *Polymathematics: is mathematics a single science or a set of arts?*, in *Mathematics: Frontiers and Perspectives*, edited by V. Arnold, M.Atiyah, P. Lax and B. Mazur, AMS, USA, 2000.

[17] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald, *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.

[18] L. Babai and P. J. Cameron, *Automorphisms and enumeration of switching classes of tournaments*, Electron. J. Comb. 7, No.1, Research paper R38, 2000; printed version J. Comb. 7, No.2, 2000.

[19] R. Baer, *Die Kompositionsreihe der Gruppe aller eineindeutigen Abbildungen einer unendlichen Menge auf sich*, Studia Mathematica, 5, 15-17, 1934.

[20] J. C. Baez, *The octonions*, Bull. Am. Math. Soc., New Ser. 39, No.2, 145-205, 2002.

[21] R. A. Bailey, *Association Schemes. Designed Experiments, Algebra and Combinatorics*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics No. 84. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

[22] R. F. Bailey and P. J. Cameron, *Base size, metric dimension and other invariants of groups and graphs*, Bull. London Math. Soc., 43 (2): 209-242, 2011.

[23] R. Baire, *Sur les fonctions de variables réelles*, Ann. di Mat., 3, 1-123, 1899.

[24] J. T. Baldwin, *The metamathematics of random graphs*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic, 143, 1-3, 20-28, 2006.

[25] J. T. Baldwin, *Categoricity*, American Mathematical Society, University Lecture Series, Volume 50, 2009.

[26] J. T. Baldwin, *Review of "The Birth of Model Theory", by Calixto Badesa*, Bull. Am. Math. Soc., 47, 1, 177-185, 2009.

[27] R. W. Ball, *Maximal subgroups of symmetric groups*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 121, 393-407, 1966.

[28] I. Bárány, *A generalization of Carathéodory's theorem*, Discrete Math. 40, 141-152, 1982.

[29] A. Barlotti and K. Strambach, *The geometry of binary systems*, Adv. Math. 49, 1-105, 1983.

[30] M. Barot and R. J. Marsh, *Reflection group presentations arising from cluster algebras*, arXiv:1112.2300v1, 10 December 2011.

[31] C. H. Barton and A. Sudbery, *Magic squares and matrix models of Lie algebras*, Adv. in Math. 180, 596-647, 2003.

[32] J. Barwise, *An introduction to first-order logic*, in *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*, edited by J. Barwise, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992.

[33] J. Barwise and L. Moss, *Vicious Circles. On the Mathematics of Non–Wellfounded Phenomena*, CSLI Lecture Notes. 60. Stanford, CA: CSLI, Center for the Study of Language and Information, 1996.

[34] S. Batterson, *Stephen Smale: The Mathematician Who Broke the Dimension Barrier*, American Mathematical Society (AMS), Providence, RI, 2000.

[35] B. Bauslaugh, *Core-like properties of infinite graphs and structures*, Discrete Math. 138, No.1-3, 101-111, 1995.

[36] J. H. Bennett, *The Reducts of Some Infinite Homogeneous Graphs and Tournaments*, Ph.D. Thesis, Rutgers University, New Jersey, October 1996.

[37] D.J. Benson, *Polynomial Invariants of Finite Groups*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 190, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[38] Á. Bereczky and Attila Maróti, *On solvable semiprimitive permutation groups*, 28th of July 2006.

[39] F. Bergeron, G. Labelle and P. Leroux, Combinatorial Species and Tree-like Structures, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications 67, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[40] G. M. Bergman, *Generating infinite symmetric groups*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 38, No.2, 429-440, 2006.

[41] G. M. Bergman and S. Shelah, *Closed subgroups of the infinite symmetric group*, Algebra Univers. 55, 2-3, 137-173, 2006.

[42] M. Bhattacharjee and D. Macpherson, *Strange permutation representations of free groups*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. 74, No.3, 267-285, 2003.

[43] M. Bhattacharjee and D. Macpherson, *A locally finite dense group acting on the random graph*, Forum Math.17, No.3, 513-517, 2005.

[44] M. Bhattacharjee, R. G. Möller, D. Macpherson, P. M. Neumann, *Notes on Infinite Permutation Groups*, Texts and Readings in Mathematics. 12. Hindustan Book Agency, New Delhi, 1997.

[45] N. L. Biggs and A. T. White, *Permutation Groups and Combinational Structures*, LMS Lecture Note Series Vol.33, Cambridge University Press, 1979.

[46] B. J. Birch, R. G. Burns, S. Oates Macdonald and P. M. Neumann, *On the orbit-sizes of permutation groups containing elements separating finite subsets*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 14, 7-10, 1976.

[47] J. S. Birman, *Recent developments in braid and link theory*, Math. Intell. 13, No.1, 52-60, 1991.

[48] A. Blass and F. Harary, *Properties of almost all graphs and complexes*, J. Graph Theory 3, 225-240, 1979.

[49] M. Bodirsky and J. Nešetřil, *Constraint satisfaction with countable homogeneous templates*, Journal of Logic and Computation, 16(3), 359-373, 2006.

[50] M. Bodirsky and M. Junker, $\aleph_0$*-categorical structure: endomorphisms and interpretations*, arXiv:0907.2925, 2009.

[51] M. Bodirsky and M. Pinsker, *Minimal functions on the random graph*, arXiv:1003.4030v2, 2010.

[52] M. Bodirsky, M. Pinsker and A. Pongrácz, *The 42 reducts of the random ordered graph*, arXiv:1309.2165, 2013.

[53] G. Bol, *Gewebe und Gruppen (Topologische Fragen der Differentialgeometrie 65.)*, Math. Ann. **114**, 414-431, 1937.

[54] B. Bollobás, *Modern Graph Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics vol.184, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.

[55] B. Bollobás, *Random graphs. 2nd ed.*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. 73. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.

[56] B. Bollobás, S. Janson and O. Riordan, *The cut metric, random graphs, and branching processes*, J. Statistical Physics 140, 289-335, 2010.

[57] A. Bonato, *On retracts of the random graph and their natural order*, Monatsh. Math. 135, 1, 1-9, 2002.

[58] A. Bonato, *Homomorphisms and amalgamation*, Discrete Math. 270, No.1-3, 33-42, 2003.

[59] A. Bonato, P. Cameron and D. Delić, *Tournaments and orders with the pigeonhole property*, Canad. Math. Bull. 43, No.4, 397-405, 2000.

[60] A. Bonato, P. Cameron, D. Delić and S. Thomassé, *Generalized pigeonhole properties of graphs and oriented graphs*, Eur. J. Comb. 23, No.3, 257-274, 2002.

[61] A. Bonato and D. Delić, *The monoid of the random graph*, Semigroup Forum, 61, 138-148, 2000.

[62] A. Bonato and D. Delić, *Distinguishing number and adjacency properties*, Journal of Combinatorics 1, No.2, 141-148, 2011,
[63] A. Bonato, D. Delić and I. Dolinka, *All countable monoids embed into the monoid of the infinite random graph*, Discrete Math. 310, 3, 373-375, 2010.
[64] A. Bonato, J. Janssen and C. Wang, *The n-ordered graphs - a new graph class*, J. Graph Theory, 60, 204-218, 2009.
[65] A. Bonato and P. Pralat, *The good, the bad, and the great: homomorphisms and cores of random graphs*, Discrete Math. 309, 18, 5535-5539, 2009.
[66] G. Boolos, J. P. Burgess, and R. Jeffrey, *Computability and Logic, 5th ed.*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007.
[67] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V. T. Sós and K. Vesztergombi, *Convergent sequences of dense graph I: subgraph frequencies, metric properties and testing*, Advances in Math. 219, 1801-1851, 2008.
[68] C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes and L. Lovász, *Moments of two-variable functions and the uniqueness of graph limits*, arXiv:0803.1244v1, 2008.
[69] K. Böröczky, N. Sauer and X. Zhu, *Inexhaustible homogeneous structures*, Discrete Math. 115, 57-63, 1993.
[70] N. Bourbaki, *Lie Groups and Lie Algebras Chapters 1-3*, Elements of Mathematics, 1st ed. 1989. 2nd printing, 1998.
[71] N. Bowler and Thomas Forster, *Normal subgroups of infinite symmetric groups, with an application to stratified set theory*, J. Symb. Log. 74, 1, 17-26, 2009.
[72] M. Brazil, J. Covington, T. Penttila, C. Praeger, and A. Woods, *Maximal subgroups of infinite symmetric groups*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc., III. Ser. 68, No.1, 77-111, 1994.
[73] C. Brouder, *Trees, renormalization and differential equations*, Numerical Mathematics 44, 425-438, 2004.
[74] A. E. Brouwer, A. M. Cohen and A. Neumaier, *Distance Regular Graphs*, Springer-Verlag, 1989.
[75] R. H. Bruck, *A Survey of Binary Systems*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg, 1958.
[76] W. Burau, *Über Zopfgruppen und gleichsinnig verdrillte Verkettungen*, Abh. Math. Semin. Hamb. Univ. 11, 179-186, 1935.
[77] J.P. Calais, Relation et multirelation pseudo-homogènes, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. A-B 265, 2-4, 1967.
[78] P. J. Cameron, *Transitivity of permutation groups on unordered sets*, Mat. Z. 148, 127-139, 1976.
[79] P. J. Cameron, *Cohomological aspects of two-graphs*, Mat. Z. 157, 101-119, 1977.
[80] P. J. Cameron, *6-transitive graphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser.B 28, 168-179, 1980.
[81] P. J. Cameron, *Orbits of permutation groups on unordered sets, II*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., (2), II. Ser. 23, 249-264, 1981.
[82] P. J. Cameron, *Random structures, universal structures and permutation groups*, handwritten notes, *c.* 1982.
[83] P. J. Cameron, *Dual polar spaces*, Geometriae Dedicata, **12**, 75–85, 1982.
[84] P. J. Cameron, *Cyclic automorphisms of a countable graph and random sum-free sets*, Graphs Comb. 1, 129-135, 1985.

[85] P. J. Cameron, *Regular orbits of permutation groups on the power set*, Discrete Math. 62, 307-309, 1986.

[86] P. J. Cameron, *Portrait of a typical sum-free set*, in *Surveys in combinatorics*, 11th Br. Combin. Conf., London/Engl. 1987, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 123, 13-42,1987.

[87] P. J. Cameron, *Some treelike objects*, Quart. J. Math., 38, 155-183, 1987.

[88] P. J. Cameron, *Groups of order-automorphisms of the rationals with prescribed scale type*, J. Math. Psychol. 33, No.2, 163-171, 1989.

[89] P. J. Cameron, *Some sequences of integers*, Discrete Math. 75, No.1-3, 89-102, 1989.

[90] P.J. Cameron, *Oligomorphic Permutation Groups*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 152, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[91] P. J. Cameron, *The age of a relational structure*, Discrete Math. 95, No.1-3, 49-67, 1991.

[92] P. J. Cameron, *Projective and Polar Spaces*. The first edition was published as QMW Maths Notes 13 in 1991. The new LaTeX edition is available on http://www.maths.qmw.ac.uk/~pjc/pps/

[93] P. J. Cameron, *Combinatorics: Topics, Techniques, Algorithms*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.

[94] P. J. Cameron, *Bases in permutation groups*, in *Automorphisms of First-Order Structures*, edited by R. Kaye and D. Macpherson, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 181-198, 1994.

[95] P. J. Cameron, *Two-graphs and trees*, Discrete Math. 127, 63-74, 1994.

[96] P. J. Cameron, *Counting two-graphs related to trees*, Electron. J. Comb. 2, Research paper R4, 1995; printed version J. Comb. 2, 65-72, 1995.

[97] P. J. Cameron, *Metric and topological aspects of the symmetric group of countable degree*, Eur. J. Comb. 17, No.2-3, 135-142, 1996.

[98] P. J. Cameron, *Cofinitary permutation groups*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 28, No.2, 113-140, 1996.

[99] P. J. Cameron, *Stories about groups and sequences*, Des. Codes Cryptography, 8, No.1-2, 109-133, 1996.

[100] P. J. Cameron, *Stories from the age of reconstruction*, Congr. Numerantium 113, 31-41, 1996.

[101] P. J. Cameron, *The algebra of an age*, in *Model Theory of Groups and Automorphism Groups*, edited by D. M. Evans, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 244, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[102] P. J. Cameron, *The random graph*, in *The Mathematics of Paul Erdős. Vol.II*, edited by Ronald L. Graham, *et al.*, Springer, Berlin, 1997.

[103] P. J. Cameron, *Oligomorphic groups and homogeneous graphs*, in *Graph Symmetry*, edited by G. Hahn and G. Sabidussi, NATO Advanced Science Institutes Series C: Mathematical and Physical Sciences 497, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 23-74, 1997.

[104] P. J. Cameron, *First-order logic*, in *Graph Connections: Relationships Between Graph Theory and Other Areas of Mathematics*, edited by L. W. Beineke and R. J. Wilson, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 70-85, 1997.

[105] P. J. Cameron, *On an algebra related to orbit-counting*, J. Group Theory 1, No.2, 173-179, 1998.

[106] P. J. Cameron, *A census of infinite distance-transitive graphs*, Discrete Math. 192, 11-26, 1998.

[107] P.J. Cameron, *Permutation Groups*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 45, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[108] P. J. Cameron, *Homogeneous Cayley objects*, Eur. J. Comb.21, No.6, 745-760, 2000.

[109] P. J. Cameron, *Homogeneous permutations*, Electronic J. Combinatorics 9(2), ♯*R*2, 2002.

[110] P. J. Cameron, *Coherent configurations, association schemes and permutation groups*, in *Groups, Combinatorics and Geometry*, Proceedings of the L.M.S. Durham symposium, Durham, UK, July 16-26, 2001, edited by A. A. Ivanov, World Scientific, River Edge, NJ, 2003.

[111] P. J. Cameron, *Topology in permutation groups*, in *Groups: Topological, Combinatorial and Arithmetic Aspects*, edited by T. W. Müller, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 311, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

[112] P. J. Cameron, *Automorphisms of graphs*, in *Topics in Algebraic Graph Theory*, edited by L. W. Beineke, R. J. Wilson and P. J. Cameron, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications 102, 137-155, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

[113] P. J. Cameron, *The random graph has the strong small index property*, Discrete Math. 291, No.1-3, 41-43, 2005.

[114] P. J. Cameron, *The Rado graph and the Urysohn space*, http://www.maths.qmul.ac.uk/~pjc/preprints/stpbg.pdf, preprint.

[115] P. J. Cameron, *Aspects of infinite permutation groups*, in *Groups St Andrews 2005. Vol. I.*, edited by C. M. Campbell et al., Selected papers of the conference, St. Andrews, UK, July 30–August 6, 2005, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 339, 1-35, 2007.

[116] P. J. Cameron and K. W. Johnson, *An investigation of countable B-groups*, Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. 102, 223-231, 1987.

[117] P. J. Cameron and P. A. Kazandis, *Cores of symmetric graphs*, J. Aust. Math. Soc. 85, 2, 145-154, 2008.

[118] P. J. Cameron, C. Laflamme, M. Pouzet, S. Tarzi and R. Woodrow, *Overgroups of the automorphism group of the Rado graph*, in *Asymptotic Geometric Analysis*, edited by Monika Ludwig, Vitali D. Milman, Vladimir Pestov, and Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann, Fields Institute Communications 68, 45-54, Springer, 2013.

[119] P. J. Cameron and D. Lockett, *Posets, homomorphisms and homogeneity*, Discrete Math. 310, 3, 604-613, 2010.

[120] P. J. Cameron and C. Martins, *A theorem on reconstruction of random graphs*, Comb. Probab. Comput. 2, No.1, 1-9, 1993.

[121] P. J. Cameron and J. Nešetřil, *Homomorphism-homogeneous relational structures*, Comb. Probab. Comput. 15, No.1-2, 91-103, 2006.

[122] P. J. Cameron, P. M. Neumann, D. N. Teague, *On the degrees of primitive permutation groups*, Math. Z. 180, 141-149, 1982.

[123] P. J. Cameron, J. J. Seidel and S. V. Tsaranov, *Signed graphs, root lattices, and Coxeter groups*, J. Algebra. 164, No.1, 173-209, 1994.

[124] P. J. Cameron and D. Stark, *A prolific construction of strongly regular graphs with the n-e. c. property*, Electron. J. Comb. 9, No.1, Research paper R31, 12 p., 2002; printed version J. Comb. 9, No.1, 2002.

[125] P. J. Cameron and S. Tarzi, *Switching with more than two colours*, Eur. J. Comb.25, 169-177, 2004.

[126] P. J. Cameron and S. Tarzi, *Limits of cubes*, Topology Appl. 155, No. 14, 1454-1461, 2008.

[127] P. J. Cameron, and D. E. Taylor, *Stirling numbers and affine equivalence*, Ars Comb. 20B, 3-14, 1985.

[128] P. J. Cameron and J. H. van Lint, *Designs, Graphs, Codes and their Links*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 22, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

[129] P. J. Cameron and A. M. Vershik, *Some isometry groups of Urysohn space*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 143, No.1-3, 70-78, 2006.

[130] P. J. Cameron and A. L. Wells, *Signatures and switching classes*, J. Comb. Theory Ser. B 40, 344-361, 1986.

[131] É. Cartan, *Le principe de dualité et la théorie des groupes simple et semi-simples*, Bull. Sci. Math.49, 361-374, 1925.

[132] H. Cartan and S. Eilenberg, *Homological Algebra*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1956.

[133] P. Cartier, *A mad day's work: from Grothendieck to Connes and Kontsevich. The evolution of concepts of space and symmetry*, Bull. Am. Math. Soc., **38**, No.4, 389-408, 2001.

[134] A. Cayley, *Desiderata and suggestions. No. 1: The theory of groups. No. 2: Graphical representation*, Am. J. Math. 1, 50-52, 174-176, 1878.

[135] J. Černý, *Poznámka k homogénnym eksperimentom s konecnými automatami*, Mat.-Fyz. Cas. Slovensk. Akad. Vied. 14: 208-216, 1964. (in Slovak)

[136] P. Charbit and A. D. Scott, *Infinite locally random graphs*, Internet Math., 3, 3, 321-332, 2006.

[137] F. Chapoton and M. Livernet, *Pre-Lie algebras and the rooted trees operad*, Int. Math. Res. Not., 395-408, 2001.

[138] G. L. Cherlin, *Homogeneous tournaments revisited*, Geometriae Dedicata 26, 231-239, 1988.

[139] G. L. Cherlin, *The Classification of Countable Homogeneous Directed Graphs and Countable Homogeneous n-Tournaments*, Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc. 621, American Math. Soc., Providence, 1998.

[140] G. Cherlin and E. Hrushovski, *Finite Structures with Few Types*, Annals of Mathematics Studies 152, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2003.

[141] G. Cherlin and P. Komjáth, *There is no universal countable pentagon-free graph*, J. Graph Theory, 18, 4, 337 - 34, 2006.

[142] G. Cherlin and S. Shelah, *Universal graphs with a forbidden subtree*, J. Comb. Theory, Series B, 97, 293-333, 2007.

[143] G. Cherlin, S. Shelah and N. Shi, *Universal graphs with forbidden subgraphs and algebraic closure*, Adv. Appl. Math. 22, No.4, 454-491, 1999.

[144] G. Cherlin and N. Shi, *Forbidden subgraphs and forbidden substructures*, J. Symb. Log. 66, No.3, 1342-1352, 2001.

[145] G. Cherlin and L. Tallgren, *Universal graphs with a forbidden near-path or 2-bouquet*, J. Graph Theory, 56, 41-63, 2007.

[146] C. Chevalley, *Collected works. Vol. 2: The Algebraic Theory of Spinors and Clifford Algebras*, edited by Pierre Cartier and Catherine Chevalley, Springer, Berlin, 1997.

[147] A. M. Childs, E. Farhi, J. Goldstone and S. Gutmann, *Finding cliques by quantum adiabatic evolution*, Quantum Information and Computation 2, 181, 2002.

[148] F. Chung, *Graph theory in the information age*, Notices Am. Math. Soc. 57, No.6, 726-732, 2010.

[149] A. Clark and L. Sadun, *When shape matters: deformations of tiling spaces*, Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. 26, 69-86, 2006.

[150] J. E. Cohen, *Threshold phenomena in random structures*, Discrete Appl. Math. 19, 113-128, 1988.

[151] D. J. Collins, R. I. Grigorchuk, P. F. Kurchanov and H. Zeichang, *Combinatorial Group Theory and Applications to Geometry*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[152] K. J. Compton, *A logical approach to asymptotic combinatorics I: First-order properties*, Advances in Mathematics 78, 65-96, 1987.

[153] J.H. Conway, *Understanding groups like* $\Gamma_0(N)$, in *Groups, Difference Sets, and the Monster*, edited by Arasu, K. T. (ed.) *et al.*, Proceedings of a special research quarter, Columbus, OH, USA, Spring 1993. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. Ohio State Univ. Math. Res. Inst. Publ. 4, 327-343, 1996.

[154] J. H. Conway, *On Numbers and Games* (2nd edition), A. K. Peters, Natick, MA, 2001.

[155] J. H. Conway, R. T. Curtis, S. P. Norton, R. A. Parker and R. A. Wilson, *Atlas of Finite Groups. Maximal Subgroups and Ordinary Characters for Simple Groups*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985.

[156] J.H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Lorentzian forms for the Leech lattice*, Bull. Am. Math. Soc., New Ser. 6, 215-217, 1982.

[157] J.H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Sphere Packings, Lattices and Groups. 3rd ed*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften. 290, Springer, New York, 1999.

[158] J. H. Conway and D. A. Smith, *On Quaternions and Octonions: their Geometry, Arithmetic, and Symmetry*, A. K. Peters, Natick, MA, 2003.

[159] J. Covington, *A universal structure for N-free graphs*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc., III. Ser. 58, 1, 1-16, 1989.

[160] J. Covington, *Homogenizable relational structures*, Ill. J. Math. 34, 4, 731-743, 1990.

[161] J. Covington, H. D. Macpherson and A. Mekler, *Some maximal subgroups of infinite symmetric groups*, Q. J. Math., Oxf. II. Ser. 47, No.187, 297-311, 1996.

[162] P. Creed and J. K. Truss, *On o-amorphous sets*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 101, 185-226, 2000.

[163] P. Creed and J. K. Truss, J. K., *On quasi-amorphous sets*, Archive for Mathematical Logic 40, 581-596, 2001.

[164] B. A. Davey and H. A. Priestley, *Introduction to Lattices and Order*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[165] C. Delhommé, M. Pouzet, G. Sági and N. Sauer, *Representation of ideals of relational structures*, arXiv:math/0607725, 2006.

[166] D. Delić and I. Dolinka, *The endomorphism monoid of the random graph has uncountably many ideals*, Semigroup Forum, 69, 1, 75-79, 2004.
[167] W. Deuber, *Partitionstheoreme für graphen*, Comment. Math. Helv. 50, 311-320, 1975.
[168] A. Devillers, M. Giudici, C. H. Li and C. Praeger, *Locally s-distance transitive graphs*, J. Graph Theory 67: n/a. doi: 10.1002/jgt.20574, 2011.
[169] K. Devlin, *The Joy of Sets. Fundamentals of Contemporary Set Theory. 2. ed.*, Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
[170] M. Deza and V. Grishukhin, *Hypermetric two-distance spaces*, Journal of Combinatorics, Information Theory and System Science 25/1-4, 89-132, 2000.
[171] P. Diaconis and S. Janson, *Graph limits and exchangeable random graphs*, Rend. Mat. Appl. (7), 28(1), 33-61, 2008.
[172] R. Diestel, I. Leader, A. Scott and S. Thomassé, *Partitions and orientations of the Rado graph*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 359, 5, 2395-2405, 2007.
[173] G. M. Dixon, *Octonions: invariant representation of the Leech lattice*, arXiv:hep-th/9504040v1, 7 April 1995.
[174] G. M. Dixon, *Octonions: invariant Leech lattice exposed*, arXiv:hep-th/9506080v1, 12 June 1995.
[175] J. D. Dixon, P. M. Neumann, and S. Thomas, *Subgroups of small index in infinite symmetric groups*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 18, 580-586, 1986.
[176] J. D. Dixon, *Most finitely generated permutation groups are free*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 22, 222-226, 1990.
[177] J. D. Dixon and B. Mortimer, *Permutation Groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics vol.163, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.
[178] L. Dolan, P. Goddard, and P. Montague, *Conformal field theories, representations and lattice constructions*, Commun. Math. Phys. 179, No.1, 61-120, 1996.
[179] L. Dolan, P. Goddard, and P. Montague, *Conformal field theory, triality and the monster group*, Phys. Lett.B 236, No.2, 165-172, 1990.
[180] W. Dörfler, *Every regular graph is a quasigroup graph*, Discrete Math. 10, 181-183, 1974.
[181] S. Doro, *Simple Moufang loops*, Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. 83, 377-392, 1978.
[182] M. Doucha, *Universal and ultrahomogeneous Polish metric structures*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1305.0501, 2013.
[183] F. R. Drake and D. Singh, *Intermediate Set Theory*, Wiley, Chichester, 1996.
[184] A. W. M. Dress, *Relaxations of periodicity in the topological theory of tilings*, J. de Physique Colloque 3, supplément to no.7, vol. 47, 29-40, 1986.
[185] M. Droste, M. Giraudet, H. D. Macpherson and N. Sauer, *Set-homogeneous graphs*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B 62, 63-95, 1994.
[186] M. Droste and D. Kuske, *On random relational structures*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A 102, 241-254, 2003.
[187] M. Droste and H. D. Macpherson, *On k-homogeneous posets and graphs*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A 56, No.1, 1-15, 1991.
[188] M. Droste and J. K. Truss, *On representing words in the automorphism group of the random graph*, J. Group Theory 9, 6, 815-836, 2006.
[189] W. Dunham, *Euler the Master of Us All*, The Mathematical Association of America, USA, 1999.

[190] R. Durrett, *Random Graph Dynamics*, Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics, Cambridge, 2006.

[191] W. Ebeling, *Strange duality, mirror symmetry, and the Leech lattice*, in *Singularity Theory*, edited by B. Bruce, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 263, 55-77, 1999.

[192] W. Ebeling, *Lattices and Codes. A Course Partially based on Lectures by F. Hirzebruch. 2nd ed.*, Advanced Lectures in Mathematics. Wiesbaden: Vieweg., 2002.

[193] N. D. Elkies, B. H. Gross, *The exceptional cone and the Leech lattice*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 1996, No.14, 665-698, 1996.

[194] M. El-Zahar and N. Sauer, *The indivisibility of the homogeneous K_n-free graphs*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B 47, No.2, 162-170, 1989.

[195] M. El-Zahar and N. Sauer, *Ramsey-type properties of relational structures*, Discrete Math. 94, 1-10, 1991.

[196] P. Embrechts and M. Maejima, *Selfsimilar Processes*, Princeton University Press, Princeton N.J., 2002.

[197] E. Engeler, *Äquivalenzklassen von n-Tupeln*, Z. Math. Logik Grundlag. Math. 5, 340-345, 1959.

[198] H. Enomoto, *Combinatorially homogeneous graphs*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B 30, 215-223, 1981.

[199] D. E. Ensley, *Automorphism-invariant measures on $\aleph_0$-categorical structures without the independence property*, J. Symb. Log. 61, 2, 640-652, 1996.

[200] C. P. Enz, *No Time to Be Brief: A Scientific Biography of Wolfgang Pauli*, Oxford University Press, 2002.

[201] P. Erdős and A. Rényi, *On the evolution of random graphs*, Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl, 5, 17-61, 1960.

[202] P. Erdős and A. Rényi, *Asymmetric graphs*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar., 14, 295-315, 1963.

[203] P. Erdős, D. J. Kleitman and B. L. Rothschild, *symptotic enumeration of K_n-free graphs*, Colloq. int. Teorie comb., Roma 1973, Tomo II, 19-27, 1976.

[204] M. Erné, *Closure*, in *Beyond topology* edited by F. Mynard et al., Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS). Contemporary Mathematics 486, 163-238, 2009.

[205] D. M. Evans, *A Note on automorphism groups of countably infinite structures*, Arch. Math. (Basel) 49, 479-483, 1987.

[206] D. M. Evans, *Model Theory of Groups and Automorphism Groups*, Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series no.244, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[207] D. M. Evans and P. R. Hewitt, *Counterexamples to a conjecture on relative categoricity*, Ann. Pure and Appl. Logic 46, No.2, 201-209, 1990.

[208] D. Evans, H. D. Macpherson and A. Ivanov, *Finite covers*, in *Model Theory of Groups and Automorphism Groups*, edited by D. M. Evans, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 244, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[209] R. Fagin, *Probabilities on finite models*, J. Symb. Log. 41, No.1, 50-58, 1976.

[210] I. A. Faradžev, M. H. Klin and M. E. Muzichuk, *Cellular rings and groups of automorphisms of graphs*, in *Investigations in Algebraic Theory of Combinatorial Objects*, edited by I. A. Faradžev, A. A. Ivanov, M. H. Klin and A.

J. Woldar, Mathematics and Its Applications. Soviet Series. 84. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. xi, 1-152, 1994.

[211] I. A. Faradžev, A. A. Ivanov, M. H. Klin and A. J. Woldar, *Investigations in Algebraic Theory of Combinatorial Objects*, Mathematics and Its Applications. Soviet Series. 84. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. xi, 1994.

[212] W. Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications, 3rd ed.*, John Wiley and Sons, New York etc., 1984.

[213] R. Fenn, R. Rimányi and C. Rourke, *The braid-permutation group*, Topology 36, No.1, 123-135, 1997.

[214] L. Fern, G. Gordon, J. Leasure and S. Pronchik, *Matroid automorphisms and symmetry groups*, Comb. Probab. Comput. 9, No.2, 105-123, 2000.

[215] T. Filk, *Random graph gauge theories as toy models for non-perturbative string theories*, Class. Quant. Grav., 17, 4841-4854, 2000.

[216] J. Folkman, *Graphs with monochromatic complete subgraphs in every edge colouring*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 18, 115-124, 1970.

[217] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky, *Cluster algebras II*, Invent. Math. 154, 53-121, 2003.

[218] T. E. Forster, *Set Theory with a Universal Set*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.

[219] R. Fraïssé, *Sur certains relations qui généralisent l'ordre des nombres rationnels*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, 237, 540-542, 1953.

[220] R. Fraïssé, *Theory of Relations*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.

[221] M. Freedman, L. Lovász, and A. Schrijver, *Reflection positivity, rank connectivity, and homomorphism of graphs*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 20, 37-51, 2007.

[222] R. M. French, *The Banach-Tarski Theorem*, Math. Intell. 10, No.4, 21-28, 1988.

[223] I. Frenkel, J. Lepowsky and A. Meurman, *Vertex Operator Algebras and the Monster*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, no. 134, Academic Press, Boston, 1988.

[224] H. Freudenthal, *Lie groups in the foundations of geometry* Adv. Math. 1, 145-189, 1963.

[225] H. Freudenthal, *Oktaven, Ausnahmegruppen und Oktavengeometrie* Geometria Dedicata 19, 1-63, 1993.

[226] C. D. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, *Origin of Symmetries*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1991.

[227] R. Frucht, *Hertellung von Graphen mit vorgegenbenen Abstrakten Gruppen*, Compositio Math. 6, 239-250, 1938.

[228] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics vol.129, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.

[229] Z. Fűredi and P. Komjáth, *Nonexistence of universal graphs without some trees*, Combinatorica 17, No. 2, 1997.

[230] A. M. Gabrielov, *Intersection matrices for certain singularities*, Funct. Anal. Appl. 7, 182-193, 1973.

[231] H. Gaifman, *Concerning models of first–order calculi*, Israel J. Math. 2, 1-17, 1964.

[232] F. Galvin, *Generating countable sets of permutations*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser. 51, No.2, 230-242, 1995.

[233] P. M. Gartside and R. W. Knight, *Ubiquity of free subgroups*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 35, 624-634, 2003.

[234] J. P. Gauntlett, *Supersymmetric monopoles and duality*, in *Duality and Supersymmetric Theories*, edited by D. I. Olive and P. C. West, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[235] G. Gauyacq, *On quasi-Cayley graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math. 77, No.1, 43-58, 1997.

[236] E. Ghys and P. de la Harpe, *Infinite groups as geometric objects (after Gromov)*, in *Ergodic Theory, Symbolic Dynamics and Hyperbolic Spaces*, edited by T. Bedford, M. Keane and C. Series, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992.

[237] P. C. Gibson, M. Pouzet, and R. E. Woodrow, *Relational structures having finitely many full-cardinality restrictions*, Discrete Math. 291, No. 1-3, 115-134, 2005.

[238] J. D. Gilbey, *Permutation groups, a related algebra and a conjecture of Cameron*, J. Algebr. Comb. 19, No.1, 25-45, 2004.

[239] M. Giudici, C. H. Li and C. E. Praeger, *Analysing finite locally -arc transitive graphs*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 356, 291-317, 2004.

[240] M. Giudici, C. H. Li and C. E. Praeger, *Some locally 3-arc transitive graphs constructed from triality*, J. Algebra 285, No. 1, 11-28, 2005.

[241] M. Giudici, C.H. Li, C.E. Praeger, Á. Seress and V. Trofimov, *On limit graphs of finite vertex-primitive graphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 114, 110-134, 2007.

[242] A. M. W. Glass, *Ordered permutation groups*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 55, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981.

[243] G. Glauberman, *Central elements in core-free groups*, J. Algebra, 4, 403-420, 1966.

[244] G. Glauberman, *On loops of odd order, II*, J. Algebra, 8, 393-414, 1968.

[245] Y. V. Glebskii, D. I. Kogan, M. I. Liogon'kii and V. A. Talanov, *Range and degree of realizability of formulas in the restricted predicate calculus*, Kibernetika 2, 17-28, 1969.

[246] D. G. Glynn, *Rings of geometries. I.*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A 44, 34-48, 1987; *ibid.* A 49, No.1, 26-66, 1988.

[247] A. V. Gnedin, *Regeneration in random combinatorial structures*, arXiv:0901.4444v1, 2009.

[248] P. Goddard, D. Olive and A. Schwimmer, *The heterotic string and a fermionic construction of the E_8 Kac-Moody Algebra*, Phys. Lett.B 157, 393-399, 1985.

[249] P. Goddard, W. Nahm, D. Olive, H. Ruegg and A. Schwimmer, *Fermions and octonions*, Commun. Math. Phys. 112, 385-408, 1987.

[250] C. D. Godsil and M. W. Newman, *Eigenvalue bounds for independent sets*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B 98, 4, 721-734, 2008.

[251] Ja. Ju. Gol'fand, A. V. Ivanov and M. H. Klin, *Amorphic cellular rings*, in *Investigations in Algebraic Theory of Combinatorial Objects*, edited by I. A. Faradžev, A. A. Ivanov, M. H. Klin and A. J. Woldar, Mathematics and Its Applications. Soviet Series. 84. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. xi, 167-186, 1994.

[252] R. Gray and D. Macpherson, *Countable connected-homogeneous graphs*, Commun. Math. Phys. 112, 385-408, 1987.

[253] R. L. Griess, Jr., *The friendly giant*, Invent. Math. 69, 1-102, 1982.

[254] R. L. Griess, Jr., *Pieces of eight: semiselfdual lattices and a new foundation for the theory of Conway and Mathieu groups*, Adv. Math. 148, 75-104, 1999.
[255] R. L. Griess, Jr. and G. Höhn, *Virasoro frames and their stabilizers for the E_8 lattice type vertex operator algebra*, J. Reine Angew. Math., 561, 1-37, 2003.
[256] A. N. Grishkov, *Lie algebras with triality*, J. Algebra, 266, 2, 698-722, 2003.
[257] A. N. Grishkov and A. V. Zavarnitsine, *Lagrange's theorem for Moufang loops*, Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc., 139, 41, 41-57, 2005.
[258] A. N. Grishkov and A. V. Zavarnitsine, *Groups with triality*, J. Algebra Appl. 5, No. 4, 441-463, 2006.
[259] A. N. Grishkov and A. V. Zavarnitsine, *Sylow's theorem for Moufang loops*, J. Algebra, 321, 1813-1825, 2009.
[260] J. Hage, T. Harju, and E. Welzl, *Euler graphs, triangle-free Graphs and bipartite graphs in switching classes*, Fundamenta Informaticae 58, 23-37, 2003.
[261] G. Haggard, D. McCarthy and A. Wohlgemuth, *Extremal edge problems for graphs with given hyperoctahedral automorphism group*, Discrete Math.14, 139-156, 1976.
[262] R. Häggkvist and J. C. M. Janssen, Jeannette, *All-even Latin squares*, Discrete Math. 157, No.1-3, 199-206, 1996.
[263] G. Hahn and C. Tardif, *Graph homomorphisms: structure and symmetry*, in *Graph Symmetry* edited by G. Hahn and G. Sabidussi, NATO Advanced Science Institutes Series C: Mathematical and Physical Sciences 497, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 107-166, 1997.
[264] P. Hall, *Some constructions for locally finite groups*, J. London Math. Soc., **34**, 305–319, 1959.
[265] J. I. Hall, *Locally finite simple Moufang loops*, Turk. J. Math., Suppl. 31, 45-61, 2007.
[266] J. I. Hall, *Central automorphisms of Latin squares and loops*, Quasigroups and Related Systems, **15**, 19-46, 2007.
[267] J. I. Hall, *Groups with triality*, RIMS Kokyuroku (Japan) 1593, 1-9, 2008.
[268] J. I. Hall and S. M. Gagola III, *Lagrange's theorem for Moufang loops*, Acta Sci. Math. 71, No. 1-2, 45-64, 2005.
[269] J. I. Hall and G. P. Nagy, *On Moufang 3-nets and groups with triality*, Acta Sci. Math. 67, No.3-4, 675-685, 2001.
[270] F. Harary, *On the notion of balance in a signed graph*, Michigan Math. J. 2, 143-146, 1953.
[271] D. Harries and Hans Liebeck, *Isomorphisms in switching classes of graphs*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. (Series A) 26, 475-486, 1978.
[272] F. Reese Harvey, *Spinors and Calibrations*, Perspectives in Mathematics, 9, Academic Press, Boston, 1990.
[273] F. Hausdorff, *Grundzüge der Mengenlehre*, Leipzig, 1914.
[274] P. Hell and J. Nešetřil, *Graphs and Homomorphisms*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.
[275] C. W. Henson, *A family of countable homogeneous graphs*, Pac. J. Math. 38, 69-83, 1971.
[276] B. Herwig, *Extending partial isomorphisms on finite structures*, Combinatorica 15, No.3, 365-371, 1995.
[277] B. Herwig and D. Lascar, *Extending partial automorphism and the profinite topology on free groups*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 352, No.5, 1985-2021, 2000.

[278] G. Higman, *On infinite simple permutation groups*, Publ. Math., Debrecen 3, 221-226, 1954.

[279] G. Higman, *Intersection matrices for finite permutation groups*, J. Algebra, 6, 22-42, 1967.

[280] G. Higman, B. H. Neumann and H. Neumann, *Embedding theorems for groups*, J. London Math. Soc. (1), 24, 247-254, 1949.

[281] G. Higman and E. Scott, *Existentially Closed Groups*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, New Series, 3, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1988.

[282] F. Hirzebruch, T. Berger and R. Jung, *Manifolds and Modular Forms*, Aspects of Mathematics vol.20, Friedr. Vieweg., Wiesbaden, 1992.

[283] W. Hodges, *Categoricity and permutation groups*, in *Logic Colloquium '87*, edited by H. D. Ebbinghaus *et al.*, North Holland , Amsterdam, 53-72, 1989.

[284] W. Hodges, *The structure of totally categorical structures*, in *Automorphisms of First-Order Structures*, edited by R. Kaye and D. Macpherson, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 111-130, 1994.

[285] W. Hodges, *Model Theory*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications no.42, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[286] W. Hodges, *A Shorter Model Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[287] W. Hodges, I. Hodkinson, D. Lascar and S. Shelah, *The small index property for ω-stable ω-categorical structures and for the random graph*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser. 48, No.2, 204-218, 1993.

[288] I. M. Hodkinson and H. D. Macpherson, *Relational structures determined by their finite induced substructures*, J. Symb. Log. 53, 1, 222-230, 2008.

[289] P. N. Hoffman and J. F. Humphreys, *Projective Representations of the Symmetric Groups*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992.

[290] M. Randall Holmes, *Symmetry as a criterion for comprehension motivating Quine's 'New Foundations'*, Stud. Log. 88, 195-213, 2008.

[291] P. Howard and J. E. Rubin, *Consequences of the Axiom of Choice*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. 59. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 1998.

[292] E. Hrushovski, *Extending partial isomorphisms of graphs*, Combinatorica 12, 411-416, 1992.

[293] E. Hrushovski, *A new strongly minimal set*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 62, 147-166, 1993.

[294] E. Hrushovski, *Finite structures with few types*, in *Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic*, Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute, Banff, Canada, April 21-May 4, 1991, edited by N. W. Sauer, R. E. Woodrow and B. Sands, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. NATO ASI Ser., Ser. C, Math. Phys. Sci., 1996.

[295] J. Hubička and J. Nešetřil, *Finite presentation of homogeneous graphs, posets and Ramsey classes*, Israel J. Math. 149, 21-44, 2005.

[296] J. Hubička and J. Nešetřil, *A Finite presentation of the rational Urysohn space*, Topology Appl. 155, 14, 1483-1492, 2008.

[297] J. Hubička and J. Nešetřil, *Universal structures as shadows of ultrahomogeneous structures*, preprint.

[298] J. E. Humphreys, *Reflection Groups and Coxeter Groups*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.

[299] J. E. Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie Algebras and Representation Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics vol.9, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.

[300] E. V. Huntingdon, *The continuum as a type of order: an exposition of the modern theory*, Ann. Math. 6, 178-179, 1904.

[301] W. Imrich, S. Klavžar and V. I. Trofimov, *Distinguishing infinite graphs*, Electron. J. Combin. 14, ♯ R36, 2007.

[302] K. Ireland and M. Rosen, *A Classical Introduction to Modern Number Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

[303] A. A. Ivanov and S. V. Shpectorov, *Applications of group amalgams to algebraic graph theory*, in *Investigations in Algebraic Theory of Combinatorial Objects*, edited by I. A. Faradžev, A. A. Ivanov, M. H. Klin and A. J. Woldar, Mathematics and Its Applications. Soviet Series. 84. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. xi, 417-442, 1994.

[304] B. Iversen, *Hyperbolic Geometry*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 25, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.

[305] J. Jaworski, M. Karoński, D. Stark, *The degree of a typical vertex in generalized random intersection graph models*, Discrete Math., preprint.

[306] T. Jech, *The infinite*, in *Jahrbuch 1990 der Kurt-Gödel-Gesellschraft*, 36-44, 1991.

[307] T. Jech, *Set Theory*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer-Verlag, 1997.

[308] T. Jech, T. and A. Sochor, *On* Θ*-model of the set theory*, Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci., Ser. Sci. Math. Astron. Phys.14, 297-303, 1966.

[309] D. L. Johnson, *Presentations of Groups. 2nd ed.*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts No.15, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[310] J. R. Johnson, *Long cycles in the middle two layers of the discrete cube*, J. Combinatorial Theory A, **105**, 255–271, 2004.

[311] P. T. Johnstone, *Stone spaces*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.

[312] G. A. Jones, *Congruence and non-congruence subgroups of the modular group: a Survey*, in *Proceedings of Groups-St. Andrews 1985*, 223-234, 1986.

[313] G. A. Jones, *Automorphisms and congruence subgroups of the extended modular group*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) 34, 26-40, 1986.

[314] G. A. Jones, *Regular embeddings of complete bipartite graphs: classification and enumeration*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 101, No. 2, 427-453, 2010.

[315] G. A. Jones, D. Singerman and K. Wicks, *The modular group and generalized Farey graphs*, in *Groups, Vol. 2, Proc. Int. Conf., St. Andrews/UK 1989*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 160, 316-338, 1991.

[316] V. F. R. Jones, *Hecke algebra representations of braid groups and link polynomials*, Ann. Math. (2) 126, 335-388, 1987.

[317] B. Jónsson, *Universal relational systems*, Mathematica Scandinavica 4, 193-208, 1956.

[318] B. Jónsson, *Homogeneous universal relational systems*, Mathematica Scandinavica 8, 137-142, 1960.

[319] Á. Joyal, *Une théorie combinatoire des séries formelles*, Adv. Math. 42, 1-82, 1981.

[320] V. Kac and P. Cheung, *Quantum calculus*, Springer New York, 2002.

[321] W. M. Kantor, *Some exceptional 2-adic buildings*, J. Algebra 92, 208-223, 1985.

[322] W. M. Kantor, M. W. Liebeck and H. D. Macpherson, $\aleph_0$-*categorical structures smoothly approximable by their finite substructures*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc., III. Ser. 59, No.3, 439-463, 1989.

[323] M. Karoński and A. Ruciński, *The origins of the theory of random graphs*, in *The Mathematics of Paul Erdős. Vol.I*, edited by Graham, Ronald L. *et al.*, Berlin: Springer, 1997.

[324] M. Karoński, E.R. Scheinerman and K.B. Singer-Cohen, *On random intersection graphs: the subgraph problem*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing, 8, 121-159, 1999.

[325] R. Kaye and D. Macpherson, *Automorphisms of First-Order Structures*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994.

[326] A. S. Kechris, V.G. Pestov and S. Todorcevic, *Fraïssé limits, Ramsey theory and topological dynamics of automorphism groups*, Geometric and Functional Analysis, 15, 1, 106-189, 2005.

[327] A. S. Kechris and C. Rosendal, *Turbulence, amalgamation and generic automorphisms of homogeneous structures*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 94, No. 2, 302-350, 2007.

[328] H. J. Keisler, *Fundamentals of Model Theory*, in *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*, edited by J. Barwise, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992.

[329] A. Kelarev and C. E. Praeger, *On transitive Cayley graphs of groups and semigroups*, Eur. J. Comb. 24, No.1, 59-72, 2003.

[330] P. J. Kelly, *A congruence theorem for trees*, Pacific J. Math., 7, 961-968, 1957; *On some mappings related to graphs*, *ibid.* 14, 191-194, 1964.

[331] F. Klein, *Vergleichende Betrachtungen über neuere geometrische Forschungen* ('A comparative review of recent researches in geometry'), 1872. Mathematische Annalen, 43, 63-100, 1893. (Also: Gesammelte Abh. Vol. 1, Springer, 1921, pp. 460-497). An English translation by Mellen Haskell appeared in Bull. N. Y. Math. Soc 2, 215–249, 1892-1893.

[332] M.-A. Knus, A. Merkurjev, M. Rost and J-P Tignol, *The Book of Involutions*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications 44, Providence RI, 1998.

[333] M. Koca and N. Ozdes, *Division algebras with integral elements*, J. Phys. A, Math. Gen. 22, No.10, 1469-1493, 1989.

[334] T. Kohno, *New Developments in the Theory of Knots*, edited by T. Kohno, Advanced Series in Mathematical Physics, 11, World Scientific, Singapore, 1990.

[335] T. Kohno, *Conformal Field Theory and Topology*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs. Iwanami Series in Modern Mathematics, American Mathematical Society Providence, RI, 2002.

[336] P. Komjáth, A. H. Mekler and J. Pach, *Some universal graphs*, Israel J. Math. 64, No. 2, 1988.

[337] P. Komjáth and J. Pach, *Universal elements and the complexity of certain classes of infinite graphs*, Discrete Math. 95, No.1-3, 255-270, 1991.

[338] D. König, *Theorie der Endlichen und Unendlichen Graphen*, Chelsea, New York, 1950.

[339] B. Kostant, *The principle of triality and a distinguished unitary representation of* $\mathrm{SO}(4,4)$, in *Differential Geometrical Methods in Theoretical Physics*, Proc. 16th Int. Conf., NATO Adv. Res. Workshop, Como/Italy 1987, NATO ASI Ser., Ser. C 250, 65-108, 1988.

[340] D. Král, L. Mach and J.-S. Sereni, *A new lower bound based on Gromov's method of selecting heavily covered points*, arXiv:math.CO/1108.0297v1, August 2011.

[341] B. Krön and R. G. Möller, *Analogues of Cayley graphs for totally disconnected topological groups*, Math. Z., 258, 3, 637-675, 2008.

[342] N. V. Kroshko and V. I. Sushchanskiĭ, *Direct limits of symmetric and alternating groups with strictly diagonal embeddings*, Arch. Math. (Basel), **71**, 173–182, 1998.

[343] G. Kun and J. Nešetřil, *Forbidden lifts (NP and CSP for combinatorialists)*, Eur. J. Comb. 29, No. 4, 930-945, 2008.

[344] E. Kunz, *Introduction to Plane Algebraic Curves*, Translated from the 1991 German edition by Richard G. Belshoff, Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 2005.

[345] A. H. Lachlan, *Countable homogeneous tournaments*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 284, 431-461, 1984.

[346] A. H. Lachlan and R. E. Woodrow, *Countable ultrahomogeneous undirected graphs*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 262, 51-94, 1980.

[347] C. Laflamme, L. Nguyen Van Thé and N. W. Sauer, *Distinguishing number of countable homogeneous relational structures*, Electron. J. Comb. 17, 1, Research Paper R20, 2010.

[348] C. Laflamme, L. Nguyen Van Thé, M. Pouzet and N. W. Sauer, *Partitions and indivisibility properties of countable dimensional vector spaces*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A 118, No. 1, 67-77, 2011.

[349] C. Laflamme, M. Pouzet and N. W. Sauer, *The hypergraph of copies of the random graph*, in preparation.

[350] D. Lascar, *The group of automorphisms of a relational saturated structure*, in *Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic*, Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute, Banff, Canada, April 21-May 4, 1991, edited by N. W. Sauer, R. E. Woodrow and B. Sands, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. NATO ASI Ser., Ser. C, Math. Phys. Sci. 411, 225-236, 1993.

[351] D. Lascar, *Automorphism groups of saturated structures; a review*, in Proceedings of the international congress of mathematicians, ICM 2002, Beijing, China, August 20-28, 2002. Vol. II Invited lectures, edited by Li, Ta Tsien, Beijing: Higher Education Press, 25-33, 2002.

[352] J. Lauri and R. Scapellato, *Topics in Graph Automorphisms and Reconstruction*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts. 54, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[353] A. Leiderman, V. Pestov, M. Rubin, S. Solecki and V. Uspenskij, editors, *Special Issue: Workshop on the Urysohn space*, Topology and its Applications, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, ISRAEL, 21-24 May 2006, Volume 155, Issue 14, 1451-1634, 15 August 2008.

[354] J. Lepowski and A. Meurman, *An* E_8 *Approach to the Leech lattice and the Conway group*, J. Algebra 77, 484-504, 1982.

[355] M. W. Liebeck, *Lie algebras, 2-graphs and permutation groups*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 12, 29-33, 1980.

[356] M. W. Liebeck, *Groups fixing graphs in switching classes*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. (Series A) 33, 76-85, 1982.

[357] M. W. Liebeck, *The classification of finite simple Moufang loops*, Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. 102, 33-47, 1987.

[358] M. W. Liebeck and C. E. Praeger, *Relation algebras and finite permutation groups*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser. 45, No.3, 433-445, 1992.

[359] M. W. Liebeck, C. E. Praeger and J. Saxl, *A classification of the maximal subgroups of the alternating and symmetric groups*, J. Algebra 111, 365-383, 1987.

[360] M. W. Liebeck, C. E. Praeger and J. Saxl, *On the O'Nan-Scott theorem for finite primitive permutation groups*, J. Aust. Math. Soc., Ser. A 44, No.3, 389-396, 1988.

[361] A. Lindenbaum, *Contributions à l'ètude de l'espace mètrique I*, Fund. Math.8, 209-222, 1926.

[362] S. L. Lipscomb, *Fractals and universal spaces in dimension theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2009.

[363] D. Lockett and J. K. Truss, *Generic endomorphisms of homogeneous structures*, preprint.

[364] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy, *Limits of dense graph sequences*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B, 96(6), 933-957, 2006.

[365] S. Lovell and J. K. Truss, *Cycle-types in the automorphism groups of countable homogeneous graphs*, Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc., 151, 23-41, 2011.

[366] T. Łuczak and L. Pyber, *On random generation of the symmetric group*, Comb. Probab. Comput. 2, No.4, 505-512, 1993.

[367] R. C. Lyndon, *Properties preserved under homomorphisms*, Pacific J. Math. 9, 143-154, 1959.

[368] R. C. Lyndon, *Groups and Geometry*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 101, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.

[369] R. C. Lyndon and P. E. Schupp, *Combinatorial Group Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1977.

[370] I. G. Macdonald, *Symmetric Functions and Orthogonal Polynomials*, University Lecture Series vol.12, American Mathematical Society, 1998.

[371] H. D. Macpherson, *Growth rates in infinite graphs and permutation groups*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3), 51, 285-294, 1985.

[372] H. D. Macpherson, *Groups of automorphisms of $\aleph_0$-categorical structures*, Q. J. Math., Oxf. II. Ser. 37, 449-465, 1986.

[373] H. D. Macpherson, *Permutation groups of rapid growth*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) 35, 276-286, 1987.

[374] H. D. Macpherson, *Absolutely ubiquitous structures and $\aleph_0$-categorical groups*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford (2) 39, 483-500, 1988.

[375] H. D. Macpherson, *Large subgroups of infinite symmetric groups*, in *Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic*, Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute, Banff, Canada, April 21-May 4, 1991, edited by N. W. Sauer, R. E. Woodrow and B. Sands, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. NATO ASI Ser., Ser. C, Math. Phys. Sci. 411, 249-278, 1993.

[376] H. S. Macpherson and P. M. Neumann, *Subgroups of infinite symmetric groups*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser. 42, No.1, 64-84, 1990.
[377] H. D. Macpherson, and C. E. Praeger, *Maximal subgroups of infinite symmetric groups*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser. 42, No.1, 85-92, 1990.
[378] H. D. Macpherson and K. Tent, *Simplicity of some automorphism groups*, preprint.
[379] H. D. Macpherson and S. Thomas, *Comeagre conjugacy classes and free products with amalgamation*, Discrete Math. 291, No.1-3, 135-142, 2005.
[380] H. D. Macpherson and R. Woodrow, *The permutation group induced on a moiety*, Forum Math. 4, 3, 243-255, 1992.
[381] C. L. Mallows and N. J. A. Sloane, *Two-graphs, switching classes, and Euler graphs are equal in number*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 28, 876-880, 1975.
[382] A. Malnič, D. Marušič, R. Møller, N. Seifter, V. Trofimov, Vladimir, B. Zgrablic, *Highly arc transitive digraphs: reachability, topological groups*, Eur. J. Comb. 26, No. 1, 19-28, 2005.
[383] B. B. Mandelbrot, *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*, W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1982.
[384] D. Marker, *Model theory: An introduction*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics vol. 217, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
[385] D. Mašulović, M. Pech, *Oligomorphic transformation monoids and homomorphism-homogeneous structures*, Fundam. Math., 212(1), 17-34, 2011.
[386] T. P. McDonough, *A permutation representation of a free group*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford (2) 28, 353-356, 1977.
[387] J. McKay and A. Sebbar, *Arithmetic semistable elliptic surfaces*, in *Proceedings on Moonshine and Related Topics*, edited by J. McKay and A. Sebbar, CRM Proceedings and Lecture Notes vol.30, AMS, 2001.
[388] S. McLeish, *The Sufficiency of Going forth in First-order Homogeneous Structures*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1994.
[389] H. McKean and V. Moll, *Elliptic Curves*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
[390] J. Meier, *Groups, Graphs and Trees. An Introduction to the Geometry of Infinite Groups*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts 73, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.
[391] A. Mekler, *Groups embeddable in the autohomeomorphisms of* $\mathbb{Q}$, J. Lond. Math. Soc. 33, 49-58, 1986.
[392] A. Mekler, R. Schipperus, S. Shelah and J. K. Truss, *The random graph and automorphisms of the rational world*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 25, 343-346, 1993.
[393] J. D. P. Meldrum, *Wreath Products of Groups and Semigroups*, Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics. 74, Longman Group Ltd., Harlow, Essex, 1995.
[394] F. Merola, *Orbits on n-tuples for infinite permutation groups*, Eur. J. Comb. 22, No. 2, 225-241, 2001.
[395] J. W. Milnor and D. H. Husemoller, *Symmetric Bilinear Forms*, Springer-Verlag, 1973.
[396] T. Miyake, *Modular Forms*, Springer-Verlag, 1989.
[397] V. Mnukhin, *Reconstruction of k-orbits of a permutation group*, Math. Notes 42, 975-980, 1987.

[398] V. Mnukhin, *The k-orbit reconstruction and the orbit algebra*, Acta Applicandae Mathematicae 29, 83-117, 1992.
[399] M. Morley, *Categoricity in power*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc., 114, 514-538, 1965.
[400] M. Morley and R. L. Vaught, *Homogeneous universal models*, Math. Scand. 11, 37-57, 1962.
[401] L. S. Moss, *Existence and nonexistence of universal graphs*, Fundamenta Mathematicae 133, 129-141, 1990.
[402] L. S. Moss, *The Universal Graphs of Fixed Finite Diameter* in *Graph Theory, Combinatorics, and Applications Vol. 2*, edited by Y. Alavi et al, John Wiley and Sons, 923-937, 1991.
[403] L. S. Moss, *Distanced graphs*, Discrete Math. 102(3), 287-305, 1992.
[404] L. S. Moss and A. Dabrowski, *The Johnson graphs satisfy a distance extension property*, Combinatorica 20, 2, 295-300, 2000.
[405] R. Moufang, *Zur struktur von alternativkörpern*, Math. Ann., 110, 416-430, 1935.
[406] C. J. Mozzochi, *The Fermat Diary*, American Mathematical Society, 2000.
[407] G. P. Nagy and M. Valsecchi, *Splitting automorphisms and Moufang*, Glasg. Math. J., 46, 305-310, 2004.
[408] G. P. Nagy and P. Vojtěchovský, *Automorphism groups of simple Moufang loops over perfect fields*, Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. 135, No.2, 193-197, 2003.
[409] G. P. Nagy and P. Vojtěchovský, *Octonions, simple Moufang loops and triality*, Quasigroups Relat. Syst. 10, 65-94, 2003.
[410] R. Nelson and R. J. Wilson, *Graph Colourings*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series no.218, Longman Scientific and Technical, England, 1990.
[411] J. Nešetřil and V. Rödl, *The structure of critical Ramsey graphs*, Colloq. Internat. C.N.R.S. 260, 307-308, 1978.
[412] J. Nešetřil, *Ramsey classes and homogeneous structures*, Comb. Probab. Comput. 14, No. 1-2, 171-189, 2005.
[413] P. M. Neumann, *The structure of finitary permutation groups*, Arch. Math. 26, 561-566, 1975.
[414] P. M. Neumann, *Generosity and characters of multiply transitive permutation groups*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc., III. Ser. 31, 457-481, 1975.
[415] P. M. Neumann, *Automorphisms of the rational world*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser. 32, 439-448, 1985.
[416] P. M. Neumann and C. E. Praeger, *Three-star permutation groups*, Ill. J. Math. 47, No.1-2, 445-452, 2003.
[417] M. Neusel, *Invariant Theory*, Student Mathematical Library No.36, American Mathematical Society, 2007.
[418] Lionel Nguyen Van Thé, *Universal flows of closed subgroups of S_∞*, in *Asymptotic Geometric Analysis*, edited by Monika Ludwig, Vitali D. Milman, Vladimir Pestov, and Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann, Fields Institute Communications 68, 229-245, Springer, 2013.
[419] M. Niemenmaa and T. Kepka, *On multiplication groups of loops*, J. Algebra 135, 112-122, 1990.
[420] J.-C. Novelli, J.-Y. Thibon and N. Thiéry, *Algèbres de Hopf de graphes*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I 339, 607-610, 2004.

[421] D. I. Olive, and P. C. West, *Duality and Supersymmetric Theories*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[422] N. Ormes, C. Radin and L. Sadun, *A homeomorphism invariant for substitution tiling spaces*, Geometriae Dedicata 90, 153-182, 2002.

[423] W. Osgood, *Non-uniform convergence and the integration of series term by term* Am. J. Math., 19, 155-190, 1897.

[424] J.C. Oxtoby, *Measure and Category. A Survey of the Analogies between Topological and Measure Spaces. 2nd ed.*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics vol.2, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980.

[425] J. Pach, *On metric properties of countable graphs*, (in Hungarian, with an English summary), Mat. Lapok, 26, 305-310, 1975.

[426] L. J. Paige, *A class of simple Moufang loops*, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. 7, 471-482, 1956.

[427] J. Paris and L. Harrington, *A Mathematical Incompleteness in Peano Arithmetic*, in *Handbook for Mathematical Logic*, edited by J. Barwise, North-Holland, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 1977.

[428] V. Pestov, *On free actions, minimal flows and a problem by Ellis*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **350**, 4149–4165, 1998.

[429] F. V. Petrov and A. M. Vershik, *Uncountable graphs and invariant measures on the set of universal countable graphs*, , Random Structures & Algorithms **37**, 3, 2010.

[430] H. O. Pflugfelder, *Quasigroups and Loops: Introduction*, Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics, Volume 7, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1990.

[431] J. D. Phillips, *Moufang loop multiplication groups with triality*, Rocky Mt. J. Math. 29, No.4, 1483-1490, 1999.

[432] J. D. Phillips, *A note on simple groups and simple loops*, in *Groups - Korea '98*, edited by Young Gheel Baik. Proceedings of the 4th international conference, Pusan, Korea, August 10-16, 1998, Walter de Gruyter: Berlin, 305-317, 2000.

[433] J. D. Phillips, private communication.

[434] J. D. Phillips, J.D. and J. D. H. Smith, *Quasiprimitivity and quasigroups*, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. 59, No.3, 473-475, 1999.

[435] F. Point and M. Prest, *Decidability for theories of modules*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser. 38, No.2, 193-206, 1988.

[436] M. Pouzet, *Sur la Theorie des Relations*, Ph.D. Thesis, Lyon, 1978.

[437] M. Pouzet, *Application de la notion de relation presque-enchaînable au dénombrement des restrictions finies d'une relation*, Z. Math. Logik Grundlag. Math., 27, 289-332, 1981.

[438] M. Pouzet, *Relations impartibles*, Dissertationes Math. CXCIII, 1981.

[439] M. Pouzet, *The profile of relations*, Glob. J. Pure Appl. Math., 2, 3, 237-272, 2007.

[440] M. Pouzet, *When the orbit algebra of group is an integral domain? Proof of a conjecture of P.J. Cameron*, Theor. Inform. Appl., 83-103, 2008.

[441] M. Pouzet and N. Sauer, *Edge partitions of the Rado graph*, Combinatorica 16, 4, 505-520, 1996.

[442] M. Pouzet and M. Sobrani, *Sandwiches of ages*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 108, No.1-3, 295-326, 2001.

[443] M. Pouzet and N. M. Thiéry, *Algebraic graph invariants and reconstruction*, C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Ser. I, Math. 333, No.9, 821-826, 2001.

[444] M. Pouzet and N. M. Thiéry, *Some relational structures with polynomial growth and their associated algebras*, arXiv:math/0601256, submitted to ROGICS'08.

[445] M. Pouzet and N. M. Thiéry, *Some relational structures with polynomial growth and their associated algebras II*, arXiv:0801.4404, presented at FPSAC'05 Taormina, June 2005.

[446] C. E. Praeger, *Closures of finite permutation groups and relation algebras*, in *Groups, Combinatorics and Geometry*, edited by M. W. Liebeck and J. Saxl, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 165, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

[447] C. E. Praeger, *Finite quasiprimitive graphs*, in *Surveys in combinatorics, 1997*, Proceedings of the 16th British combinatorial conference, London, UK, July 1997, edited by R. A. Bailey, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 241, Cambridge University Press, pp. 65-85, 1997.

[448] C. E. Praeger, *Quasiprimitivity: Structure and combinatorial applications*, Discrete Math. 264, No.1-3, 211-224, 2003.

[449] M. Presburger, *Über die Vollständigkeit eines gewissen Systems der Arithmetik ganzer Zahlen, in welchem die Addition als einzige Operation hervortritt*, in Comptes Rendus du I congrès de Mathématiciens des Pays Slaves, Zusatz ebenda, 92-101, 1930.

[450] M. Prest, *Representation embeddings and the Ziegler spectrum*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 113, No.3, 315-323, 1996.

[451] M. Prest, *Interpreting modules in modules*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 88, No.2-3, 193-215, 1997.

[452] C. Radin, *Global order from local sources*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 25, 335-364, 1991.

[453] R. Rado, *Universal graphs and universal functions*, Acta Arith. 9, 331-340, 1964.

[454] P. Ramond, *The sirens of eleven dimensions*, arXiv:hep-th/0411024, 1 Nov.2004.

[455] A. Rapoport, *Mathematical models of social interaction*, in *Handbook of Mathematical Psychology, vol.2*, edited by R. D. Luce, R. R. Bush and E. Galanter, Wiley, New York, pp.493-579, 1963.

[456] A. A. Razborov, *Flag algebras*, J. Symb. Log., 72, 4, 1239-1282, 2007.

[457] A. A. Razborov, *What is... a flag algebra*, Notices of the AMS 60(10), 1324-1327, 2013.

[458] M. Requardt, *Quantum spacetime as a statistical geometry of lumps in random networks*, Classical Quantum Gravity 17, No.10, 2029-2057, 2000.

[459] L. Ribes and P. Zalesskii, *Profinite Groups*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2000.

[460] F. Richman, *Maximal subgroups of infinite symmetric groups*, Can. Math. Bull. 10, 375-381, 1967.

[461] D. J. S. Robinson, *A Course in the Theory of Groups, 2nd.ed.*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics vol.80, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[462] R. M. Robinson, *An essentially undecidable axiom system* in *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematics*, 729-730, 1950.

[463] B. I. Rose and R. E. Woodrow, *Ultrahomogeneous structures*, Z. Math. Logik Grundlagen Math. 27, 23-30, 1981.
[464] G-C Rota, *Indiscrete Thoughts*, Birkhauser, Boston, 1997.
[465] R. Rouquier, *Weyl groups, affine Weyl groups and reflection groups*, in *Representations of Reductive Groups*, Publ. Newton Inst., pp.21-39, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.
[466] M. Rubin, *On the reconstruction of $\aleph_0$-categorical structures from their automorphism groups*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc., III. Ser. 69, No.2, 225-249, 1994.
[467] M. Rusinov and P. Schweitzer, *Homomorphism-Homogeneous Graphs*, J. Graph Theory 65, No. 3, 253-262, 2010.
[468] C. Ryll-Nardzewski, *On category in power $< \aleph_0$*, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Math. Astronom. Phys. 7, 545-548, 1959.
[469] G. Sabidussi, *On a class of fixed-point-free graphs*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 800-804, 1958.
[470] G. Sabidussi, *Vertex-transitive graphs*, Monatsh. Math. 68, 426-438, 1964.
[471] N. Sauer, *Coloring subgraphs of the Rado graph*, Combinatorica, 26, 2, 231-253, 2006.
[472] N. Sauer and M. G. Stone, *A Galois correspondence between algebras and endomorphisms*, Universal algebra, Proc. Colloq., Esztergom/Hung. 1977, Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai 29, 691-695, 1982.
[473] N. Sauer and M. G. Stone, *Monoids and their local closures*, Universal algebra, Proc. Colloq., Esztergom/Hung. 1983, Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai 43, 455-467, 1983.
[474] J. Schreier and S. Ulam, *Ueber die Permutationsgruppe der natűrlichen Zahlenfolge*, Studia Mathematica 4, 134-141, 1933.
[475] J. H. Schmerl, *Countable homogeneous partially ordered sets*, Algebra Universalis 9, 317-321, 1979.
[476] I. Schur, *Uber die Kongruenz $x^m + y^m = z^m \pmod p$*, Jahresber. Deutsch. Math.-Verein. 25, 114-116, 1916.
[477] L. L. Scott, *Representations in characteristic p*, Santa Cruz Conference on Finite Groups 1979, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 37, 319-331, 1980.
[478] W. R. Scott, *Group Theory*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1964.
[479] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Monopoles, duality and chiral symmetry breaking in $N = 2$ supersymmetric*, Nucl. Phys. B 431, No.3, 484-550, 1994.
[480] J. J. Seidel, *Strongly regular graphs of L_2-type and of triangular type*, Proc. Kon. Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Ser. A70 (= Indag. Math. 29), 188-196, 1967.
[481] J. J. Seidel, *A survey of two-graphs*, in *Proc. Internat. Coll. Teorie Combinatorie*, (Roma 1973), Accad. Naz. Lincei, Roma, 485-511, 1977.
[482] J. J. Seidel, *Geometry and Combinatorics, "Selected Works"*, edited by D. G. Corneil and J. J. Seidel, Academic Press, San Diego, 1991.
[483] J. J. Seidel and D. E. Taylor, *Two-graphs, a second survey*, in *Algebraic Methods in Graph Theory*, edited by L. Lovász and V. T. Sós, Vol. II, Conf. Szeged 1978, Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai 25, 689-711, 1981.
[484] J. J. Seidel and S.V. Tsaranov, *Two-graphs, related topics, and root systems*, Bull. Soc. Math. Belg. Sér. A 42, No.3, 695-711, 1990.
[485] J.-P. Serre, *A Course in Arithmetic*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics vol.7, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1978.

[486] A. Shalev, *Asymptotic group theory*, Notices Am. Math. Soc. 48, No.4, 383-389, 2001.

[487] R. Shankar, *Solvable models with self-triality in statistical mechanics and Field Theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett.46, 6, 379-382, 1981.

[488] S. Shelah, *Classification Theory and the Number of Non-isomorphic Models*, 2nd rev. ed., Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, 92, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990.

[489] G. C. Shephard and J. A. Todd, *Finite unitary reflection groups*, Canad. J. Math. 6, 274-304, 1954.

[490] W. Sierpiński, *Une propriété topologique des ensembles dénombrables denses en soi*, Fund. Math. 1, 11-16, 1920.

[491] W. Sierpiński, *General Topology*, translated by C. Cecilia Krieger, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1952.

[492] J. H. Silverman and J. Tate, *Rational Points on Elliptic Curves*, Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1992.

[493] T. Skolem, *Logisch-kombinatorische Untersuchungen über die Erfüllbarkeit und Beweisbarkeit mathematischen Sätze nebst einem Theoreme über dichte Mengen*, Videnskabsakademiet i Kristiania, Skrifter I, No. 4, 1-36, 1919. Also in "Selected Works in Logic by Th. Skolem", edited by Jens Erik Fenstak, Scand. Univ. Books, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo, pp. 103-136, 1970. [The first section is translated in: From Frege to Gödel, van Heijenoort, Harvard Univ. Press, 252-263, 1971.]

[494] N. J. A. Sloane, *A Handbook of Integer Sequences*, Academic Press, New York, 1973. (See also http://www.research.att.com/njas/sequences/)

[495] P. Slodowy, *Platonic Solids, Kleinian Singularities and Lie Groups*, Algebraic Geometry LNM 1008, 102-138, Springer-Verlag, 1983.

[496] P. Slodowy, *Beyond Kac-Moody algebras and inside*, CMS Conf. Proc. 5, 361-371, 1986.

[497] L. Smith, *Polynomial Invariants of Finite Groups*, Research Notes in Mathematics (Boston, Mass.). 6. Wellesley, MA: A. K. Peters., 1995.

[498] J. D. H. Smith, *Ternary quasigroups and the modular group*, Commentat. Math. Univ. Carol. 49, No. 2, 309-317, 2008.

[499] J. D. H. Smith, *Groups, triality, and hyperquasigroups*, J. Pure Appl. Alg. 216, 811-825, 2012.

[500] B. Soderberg, *A general formalism for inhomogeneous random graphs*, Physical Review E 66, 066121, 2002.

[501] R. Solomonoff and A. Rapoport, *Connectivity of random nets*, Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics, 13, 107-117, 1951.

[502] J. Spencer, *The Strange Logic of Random Graphs*, Algorithms and Combinatorics vol.22, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.

[503] J. Spencer, *The giant component: the golden anniversary*, Notices Am. Math. Soc. 57, No.6, 720-724, 2010.

[504] R. P. Stanley, *Invariants of finite groups and their applications to combinatorics*, Bull. Am. Math. Soc., New Ser. 1, 475-511, 1979.

[505] J. Stillwell, *The evolution of exceptional objects*, Am. Math. Mon.105, No.9, 850-858, 1998.

[506] G. Stoller, *Example of a subgroup of S_∞ which has a set transitive property*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 69, 220-221, 1963.

[507] E. Study, *Geometrie der Dynamen*, Teubner, Leipzig, 1903.
[508] B. Sudakov and M. Krivelevich, *The phase transition in random graphs - a simple proof*, arXiv:1201.6529, 2012.
[509] L. Svenonius, $\aleph_0$*-categoricity in first-order predicate calculus*, Theoria 25, 82-94, 1959.
[510] H. P. F. Swinnerton-Dyer, *A Brief Guide to Algebraic Number Theory*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts No.50, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
[511] Á. Szendrei, *A survey of clones closed under conjugation*, in *Galois Connections and Applications*, edited by K. Denecke, M. Erné and S. L. Wismath, Kluwer, 297-343, 2004.
[512] T. Tao, *A correspondence principle between (hyper)graph theory and probability theory, and the (hyper)graph removal Lemma*, J. Anal. Math. 103, 1-45, 2007.
[513] T. Tao, *Structure and randomness. Pages from year one of a mathematical blog* American Mathematical Society (AMS), Providence, RI, 2008.
[514] S. Tarzi, *Group Actions on Amorphous Sets and Reducts of Coloured Random Graphs*, Ph.D. Thesis (unpublished), University of London, 2002.
[515] D. E. Taylor, *Some Topics in the Theory of Finite Groups*, Ph.D. Thesis (unpublished), University of Oxford, 1971.
[516] D. E. Taylor, *Regular 2-graphs*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc., III. Ser. 35, 257-274, 1977.
[517] R. Taylor and A. Wiles, *Ring-theoretic properties of certain Hecke algebras*, Ann. Math. (2), 141, No.3, 553-572, 1995.
[518] S. Thomas, *Reducts of the random graph*, J. Symb. Log. 56, No.1, 176-181, 1991.
[519] S. Thomas, *Reducts of random hypergraphs*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 80, No.2, 165-193, 1996.
[520] W. P. Thurston, *Conway's tiling groups*, Am. Math. Mon. 97, No.8, 757-773, 1990.
[521] W. P. Thurston, *On proof and progress in mathematics*, Bull. Am. Math. Soc., New Ser. 30, No.2, 161-177, 1994.
[522] J. Tits, *Algèbres alternatives, Algèbres de Jordan et algebres de Lie exceptionelles*, Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A 69, 223-237, 1966.
[523] J. Tits, *Four presentations of Leech's lattice*, in *Finite simple groups II*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. Res. Symp., Univ. Durham 1978, 303-307, 1980.
[524] V. I. Trofimov, *Automorphisms of graphs and a characterization of lattices*, Math. USSR Izvestia 22, 2, 379-391, 2004.
[525] V. I. Trofimov, *On the action of a group on a graph*, Acta Applicandae Mathematicae 29, 161-170, 1992.
[526] V. I. Trofimov, *On a property of Urysohn's universal metric space*, Math. Notes 69, No.2, 288-289, 2001.
[527] J. K. Truss, *The group of the countable universal graph*, Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. 98, 213-245, 1985.
[528] J. K. Truss, *Embeddings of infinite permutation groups*, in *Proceedings of Groups – St. Andrews 1985*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 121, 335-351, 1986.

[529] J. K. Truss, *The group of almost automorphisms of the countable universal graph*, Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. 105, 223-236, 1989.
[530] J. K. Truss, *Infinite simple permutation groups - a survey*, in *Proceedings of Groups – St. Andrews 1989*, Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser. 160, 463-484, 1991.
[531] J. K. Truss, *Generic automorphisms of homogeneous structures*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc., III. Ser. 65, No.1, 121-141, 1992.
[532] J.K. Truss, *The structure of amorphous sets*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 73, 2, 191-233, 1995.
[533] J. K. Truss, *The automorphism group of the random graph: four conjugates good, three conjugates better*, Discrete Math. 268, 257-271, 2003.
[534] P. Urysohn, *Sur un espace métrique universel*, Bull. Sci. Math 51, 43-64, 74-90, 1927.
[535] J. H. van Lint and J. J. Seidel, *Equilateral points in elliptic geometry*, Proc. Kon. Nederl. Acad. Wetensch., Ser. A, 69, 335-348, 1966.
[536] R. L. Vaught, *Applications of the Löwenheim–Skolem–Tarski theorem to problems of completeness and decidability*, Indag. Math. 16, 467-472, 1954.
[537] R. L. Vaught, *Models of complete theories*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 69, 299-313, 1963.
[538] A. M. Vershik, *Random metric spaces and universality*, Russ. Math. Surv. 59, 2, 259-295, 2004.
[539] A. M. Vershik, *Globalization of the partial isometries of metric spaces and local approximation of the group of isometries of Urysohn space*, arXiv:0803.4300, 2008.
[540] E. B. Vinberg, *Lie groups and Lie algebras, III*, editor, volume 41 of Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
[541] S. Wagon, *The Banach-Tarski Paradox*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its applications, Vol. 24, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985
[542] R. C. Walker, Russell, *The Stone-Cech compactification*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. Band 83, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1974.
[543] W. C. Waterhouse, *Profinite groups are Galois groups*, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. 42, 639-640, 1974.
[544] D. J. Watts, *Six Degrees*, Heinemann, London, 2003.
[545] B. A. F. Wehrfritz, *Finite Groups*, World Scientific, Springer-Verlag, 1999.
[546] B. Weisfeiler and A. A. Lehman, *A reduction of a graph to a canonical form and an algebra arising during this reduction*, Nauchno-Technicheskaya Informatsiya, Ser. 2, no. 9, 12-16, 1968 (in Russian).
[547] B. Weiss, *Single Orbit Dynamics*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics 95, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
[548] A. L. jun. Wells, *Even signings, signed switching classes, and* $(-1, 1)$*-matrices*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B 36, 194-212, 1984.
[549] E. Welzl, *Color families are dense*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 17, 29-41, 1982.
[550] E. Welzl, *Symmetric graphs and interpretations*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B 37, 235-244, 1984.
[551] H. Wielandt, *Finite Permutation Groups*, Academic Press, New York, 1964.
[552] H. Wielandt, *Permutation groups through invariant relations and invariant functions*, Lecture Notes, Ohio State University, 1969.

[553] A. Wiles, *Modular elliptic curves and Fermat's last theorem*, Ann. Math., 141, No.3, 443-551, 1995.

[554] H. S. Wilf, *Generatingfunctionology, 3rd ed.*, A K Peters, Wellesley MA, 2006.

[555] J. S. Wilson, *Profinite Groups*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1998.

[556] R. A. Wilson, *The geometry of the Hall-Janko group as a quaternionic reflection group*, Geom. Dedicata 20, 157-173, 1986.

[557] R. A. Wilson, *Octonions and the Leech lattice*, J. Algebra 322, No. 6, 2186-2190, 2009.

[558] P. Winkler, *Random structures and zero-one laws*, in *Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic*, Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute, Banff, Canada, April 21-May 4, 1991, edited by N. W. Sauer, R. E. Woodrow and B. Sands, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. NATO ASI Ser., Ser. C, Math. Phys. Sci. 411, 399-420, 1993.

[559] X. Xu, *Braid group actions, intertwining operators and ternary moonshine spaces*, Far East J. Math. Sci. 5, No.3, 337-380, 1997.

[560] F. Zara, *(G, D)-Modules et algebres de Clifford*, Geom. Dedicata 35, 155-176, 1990.

[561] T. Zaslavsky, *Togs (generalizations of two-graphs)*, in *Optimization, Design of Experiments and Graph Theory*, Proc. Symp., Bombay, 1986, edited M.N. Gopalan and G.A. Patwardhan, Indian Inst. of Technology, Bombay, 314-334, 1988.

[562] T. Zaslavsky, *Line graphs of switching classes*, Original version appeared in: Report of the XVIIIth O.S.U. Denison Maths Conference (Granville, Ohio, 1984), pp. 2-4. Dept. of Math., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio, 1984. Revised version: Dept. of Math. Sci., Binghampton Univ. (SUNY), 2006.

[563] B. I. Zil'ber, *Uncountably Categorical Theories*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993.

Index

Ackerman, N., 263, 326
adjacency matrix, 28, 70, 71, 73, 81, 321
age, 95, 96, 99, 106, 210, 260, 266, 286, 323, 325, 329, 330, 355, 369, 370, 372, 373
age
  inexhaustible, 369
  quasi-inexhaustible, 369
age algebra, 102, 106, 367–372
Ahlbrandt, G., 223
Aldous, D., 261, 353
$\aleph_0$-categorical, 2, 5, 13, 64, 161, 212, 216–218, 220, 222, 223, 230, 235, 282, 311, 312, 323, 336, 342, 345, 350, 355, 361, 371
algebraic closure, 217
almost homogeneous, 34
almost stabilizer, 366
Alon, N., xviii, xxviii, 348
Alperin, J. L., xxiv, 166
alternative laws, 390
amalgamation property, 34, 324
amalgamation property
  free, 328, 356
  pseudo-, 224
  strong, 106, 263, 266, 286, 324
amenable, 256
amorphous set, 238
amorphous set
  bounded, 239
  strictly, 240
ample generic element, 364
arc, 199, 300
Arnold, V. I., 282, 382
Artin diassociativity theorem, 151
association scheme, 267, 270
association scheme
  associate classes, 267
  infinite, 267
  permutation group, 271
  representation of, 269
  superscheme, 271
ATLAS, 134
automorphism
  central, 386–388
  cyclic, xxiii, 116, 117, 119, 120, 289
  generic, 35, 363
  inner, 141, 155, 159, 161, 379
  limit, 305
  outer, xxiv, 16, 133, 135, 138, 146, 151, 158–162, 376, 379, 380, 382
  partial, 145, 245, 356
axiom, 308
axiom of anti-foundation, 236, 391
axiom of choice, xvi, xxvi, 60, 174, 209, 239, 251, 303, 392
axiom of foundation, 236, 391, 392
axiom of universality, 237

Böröczky, K., 106
Bárány, I., 357
back-and-forth method, 2, 3, 49, 196, 216, 324, 332, 345
Baer, R., 239
Baer–Schreier–Ulam Theorem, 240, 244, 303
Bailey, R. A., 270
Bailey, Robert F., 356
Baire category theorem, 35, 36, 120, 123, 124, 126, 130, 136, 239, 260, 314, 317–319
Baire, R., 314

Baldwin, J., 350, 358
Banach space, 229, 330
Banach-Tarski Theorem, 255
Barot, M., 78
Barwise, J., 236
Bauslaugh, B., 207
Bell number, 113
Bennett, J.H., xx, 18, 19, 22
Bergman, G., 360
Bernoulli measure, xxviii, 321
Bernoulli shift, 321
Bernoulli trials, xix
Bhattacharjee, M., 145, 356
bi-definable structure, 311
bi-interpretable structure, 312, 361–363
Blass, A., 349
blocks of imprimitivity, 297
Bodirsky, M., xxvi, 190, 217, 221, 223, 272, 282, 357
Bodirsky-Pinsker Theorem, 222
Bol, reflection, 386
Bollobás, B., 353, 358
Bonato, A., 224, 356
Boolean algebra, 182
boolean algebra, xiv
Borel measure, xxviii, 321
Borel set, 316, 317
Borel-Cantelli lemmas, xix
Borgs, C., 352
Bose-Mesner algebra, 268, 271
Bott, R., 381
bounded isometries, 230
Bowler, N., 245
braid relations, 274
Brauer's Lemma, 12
Brooke, P. L. H., 280
Bruck, R.H., 385
Burau, W., 292
Burnside, W., 162, 298

Calais, J. P., 328
Cameron, P. J., xxvii, 69, 71, 72, 85, 95, 116, 121, 164, 165, 200, 231, 266, 296, 298, 330, 356, 363, 367, 370
canonical language, 309
canonical structure, 238, 309
Cantor Normal Form, 237
Cantor set, 254
Cantor's theorem, 182, 334, 341
Cantor, G., 237, 254, 335
Cantor-Schröder-Bernstein Theorem, 208
Cartan triality, 133, 134, 138–140, 157, 158, 377, 379–382, 390
Cartan, É., 134, 158, 277, 293, 376, 390
categorical in power, xvi
categoricity, xvi, 3, 310, 336
category theory, 79, 338
Cauchy sequence, 124, 215, 360
Cayley numbers, 390
Cayley object, xxiv, 121–123, 132
Cayley, A., xxiii, 115, 296
centralizer algebra, 268
chamber system, 127
chaos, 118
character
  Dirichlet, 393
  primitive, 394
  quadratic, 393
  table, 99
Chayes, J., 352
Cherlin, G. L., 33, 265, 330, 362
Cherlin–Mills–Zil'ber Theorem, 173
Chinese Remainder Theorem, 394
chromatic number, 203
Clifford algebra, 279, 376, 377
clone, 221, 271
clone
  locally closed (local), 221
clopen set, 180–182
closed set, 103, 183, 315, 318, 407
closure axioms, 205
cluster algebras, 78
Cohen, J., 350
Cohen, P., 339
coherent configuration (cellular ring), 269
combinatorics, xvi, 210, 348, 371, 374
Compactness Theorem, xvi, 308, 310, 340, 342
Compton, K., 351
congruence, 50, 60, 227, 230, 255, 297, 302, 395

Continuum Hypothesis, 339
Conway, J. H., 127, 283
coset space, 296
countably categorical, 341
Covington, J., xxiv, 34, 166, 285, 329
Coxeter
  group, 69, 83, 86, 274, 280
Coxeter-Dynkin diagram, 74
cubic reciprocity, 394
cyclically dense conjugacy class, 121

Dörfler, W., 147
Dabrowski, A., 233
de Finetti's theorem, 354
de Finetti, B., 258, 261, 354
Dedekind finite set, 239
Deduction Theorem, 336
definable
  ∅-definable, 161, 311
  k-ary relation, 311
  closure, 263
Delić, D., 356
dense open set, 36, 118, 125, 145, 239, 314, 354
dense set, 314, 359
density function, 316
depth-first, 350
Deuber, W., 15
Deza, M., 248
Diaconis, P., 352
digraph, 146, 199, 305
digraph
  quasi-Cayley, 147
direct limit, 67, 68, 282, 286, 382
disjoint embedding property, 369
Dixon, J. D., 365, 366
Doro, S., 140, 152, 158, 387, 389
Doucha, M., 231
Downward Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem, 308, 340
Dress, A. W. M., 127
Droste, M., 6, 344
dual polar space, 289
Dynkin diagram, 129

Eisenstein integers, 132, 382
El-Zahar, M., 32, 106, 254
elementary map, 312, 361, 363
Engeler, E., xviii, 217, 310, 341
Engeler–Ryll-Nardzewski–Svenonius Theorem, xviii, xxvi, xxviii, 210, 215, 217, 219, 222, 230, 312, 335, 341, 349
epsilon number, 237
equiangular lines, 81
Erdős, P., xiii, 5, 14, 259, 315, 321, 332, 347, 348, 350, 353, 354
Euclidean domain, 394
Euclidean geometry, 133, 340
Euclidean lattice, 74, 274
Euclidean metric, 132
Euclidean plane, 128
Euclidean space, 40, 131, 229, 357
Euler graph, 12
Euler, L., xiii
Evans, D. M., 359, 361
existentially closed (e.c.), 312, 345
existentially closed (e.c.)
  weak, 356
expansion, 308
exponential generating function, 373
extension, 308

Fagin, R., 348, 349
fibre bundle, 58
field, 315
filter, 173, 174, 184, 192, 242–244, 285, 365
filter
  Fréchet, 175
  neighbourhood, 175
  principal, 174
  trivial, 174, 175, 192
  ultrafilter, 174, 178, 192, 194
finite homogeneous substructure, xvii, 235
first category, 314
first-order language, 238, 307, 312, 313, 323, 334, 335, 340, 348
first-order logic, xvi, 306, 307, 334, 337, 340, 351, 355, 392
first-order property, 2, 306, 310, 311, 350, 351
first-order sentence, xviii, 2, 306, 307, 323, 341, 345, 346, 349
first-order structure, xviii–xx, 2, 42, 60, 212, 306, 308, 310, 311, 359, 361

first-order theory, 232, 312–314, 348
Fischer system, 280
Fischer, B., 280, 381
flag algeras, 353, 357
flow, 331
Fomin, S., 78
formula, 307
formula
  atomic, 307
  consistent, 308
  existential positive, 222
  logically valid, 308
  primitive positive, 222, 357
Forster, T. E., 245
forth, 216
Fréchet, M., 175
Fraïssé class, 102, 229, 237, 324, 328, 330, 331, 346, 375
Fraïssé class, oligomorphic, 328
Fraïssé limit, xxvi, 6, 23, 124, 282, 305, 324, 325, 328, 329, 331, 368
Fraïssé's Theorem, xv, xviii, xxvi, 210, 211, 265, 323, 324, 329
Fraïssé, R., xvii, 32, 106, 323, 328, 330, 369
Fraenkel-Mostowski set theory, 239, 242
Frasnay, C., 331
Freedman, M., 353
Freer, C., 263, 326
Freudenthal-Tits magic square, 383
Friedman, H., 339
fundamental signing, 71

Gabrielov transformation, 71
Galois
  connection, 271, 272, 290
  correspondence, 98, 271, 290, 291
  extension, 99
  theory, 100, 270
GAP, 37, 87
Gartside, P. M., 363
gauge group, 241
gauge of partition, 241
Gauyacq, G., 147
generic group element, 35
generic structure, 33, 35, 364
Gentzen, G., 339
giant component, xix, 350
Gilbert, E. N., xiii
Gilbey, J. D., 368
Giudici, M., 305
Glasner, E., 331
Glasner-Weiss theorem, 331
Glauberman, G., xxv, 140, 387
Glebskii, Y., 348
global section, 51, 59, 60, 303
Glynn, D. G., 103
Gnedin, A., 325, 326
Gödel's Completeness Theorem, 337
Gödel, K., 308, 338
Gödel–Henkin Completeness Theorem, 308, 312
Godsil, C. D., 270
Golay code, 277
Golay code
  ternary, 132
Goodstein's Theorem, 339
graded algebra, 367
Gram matrix, 40, 70, 77, 82
graph
  algebra, 353
  algebraically closed, 223
  all automorphisms, 160
  almost homogeneous, 23
  anti-automorphism, 14, 15, 176, 178, 183
  arc-transitive, 299
  asymmetric, 346
  automorphism, 344
  bipartite, 82, 185, 226, 299, 300
  Cayley, xxiii, xxiv, 116, 118, 123, 125, 127, 130, 136, 148, 155, 282, 283, 291, 299, 301, 305, 323
  Cayley
    normal, 147
  chromatic number, 203
  clique number, 203
  combinatorially connected-homogeneous, 404
  combinatorially homogeneous, 399, 404
  connected, 272, 368, 399
  connected-homogeneous, 405
  core, 201, 202, 205
  core
    great, 224

core-transitive, 201
coset, 300
cover, 300
Covington, 34, 335
cycle-free, 33
deck, 376
degree-regular, 405
dense, 352, 353
diameter, 195, 345
diameter-N, 232
distance-homogeneous, 232, 233, 248
distance-regular, 405
distance-transitive, 247, 289, 405
distance-transitive
  locally, 405
distinguishing number, 355
DSML, 81
edge-transitive, 202, 300
edgeless, 253
empty, 101, 347
endomorphism, 201
Eulerian, 368
even, 368
F-geodesic, 405
geodetic, 405
G-locally primitive, 300
Hamiltonian, 351
Hamiltonian path, 116, 196
Henson, 32, 33, 120, 203, 210, 217, 228, 247, 248, 258, 260, 262, 286, 297, 321, 326
hom-equivalent, 202
homogeneous, xv, 3, 399, 404
homomorphism, 85, 199, 201
homomorphism-equivalent, 201
hull, 202, 205
hypomorphic, 376
indivisible, 32
induced subgraph, 3, 84, 309
intersection, 32
invariant, 344
isometric embedding, 231
isomorphism, 344
Johnson, 233
k-arc-transitive, 404
k-CS-homogeneous, 405
k-CS-transitive, 405
K_k-free, 32
Kneser, 147
labelled, 160
limit, xiv, 305, 352
local, 75
local
  rim, 75
locally (G, s)-arc transitive, 300
locally s-arc transitive, 277, 300
locally finite, 196
locally homogeneous, 404
locally P-homogeneous, 404
locally primitive, 300
loopless, 307
metrically k-homogeneous, 404
metrically homogeneous, 404
multiplicative parameter, 352
n-existentially closed, 233, 345
n-existentially closed
  strongly, 352
N-free, 34, 85, 275
ordered, 282
oriented, 199, 252, 392
oriented
  random, 267
outer automorphism, 159, 160
P-equivalent, 41, 66
Paley, 346
path, 199
P_m-equivalent, 55, 85
P_m-equivalent, 65, 66
p-partite, 247
primitive Cayley, 302
pseudograph, 199
quotient, 300
R-core, 207
Rado's, xv
random, xiii–xvi, xviii–xx, 1, 5, 12, 14, 16, 23, 33, 52, 59, 82, 108, 116, 148, 149, 161, 168, 170, 174, 175, 195, 200, 217, 220, 225, 228, 232, 233, 235–238, 247, 252, 254, 256, 260, 277, 282, 286, 297, 304, 307, 313, 314, 320, 321, 329, 332, 334, 345–352, 363, 370, 391
random

m-coloured, xx–xxiii, xxvi, 1, 4, 13, 45, 49, 56, 95, 97, 130, 131, 160, 170, 247, 248, 253, 299, 311, 323, 342, 346
n-ordered, 351
bipartite, xxii, 23–25, 33, 118, 174, 184, 225, 228, 235
bipartite process, 347
categoricity, 336
cyclic oriented, 253
directed, 392
exchangeable, 262, 353
infinite locally, 223
inhomogeneous, 353
integral domain, 369
intersection, 32
line graph, 161
models, 347
ordered, 282
oriented, 253
polynomial algebra, 367
polynomial ring, 368
process, 347
with coloured vertices, 29, 32
reflexive, 199
regular, 10
retract, 201, 207
retraction, 201
rigid, 351
$\mathfrak{R}_m$-genic, 148, 150, 386
rough Cayley, 302
S-equivalent, 41
Seidel-minimal, 357
signed, 69, 272
signed complete, 76
simple, 9, 307
SML, 79, 83
spanning, 80, 96, 174, 175, 196, 200, 202, 204, 212, 220, 291
strongly regular, 10
switched c-clique, xxii, 46
switching, 275
switching anti-automorphism, 14
symmetric, 405
topological universal, 321
transitive, 399
triality, vi, xiii, xxi, 1–3, 19, 22, 32, 40, 42, 43, 124, 158, 236, 258, 346, 377, 392
triality
with coloured vertices, 6
triangle-free, 33, 120, 259, 260, 321, 326, 405
triangle-free
random, 260
trivial, 344
two-graph, xx, 11, 28, 41, 55, 56, 58, 64, 71, 73, 77, 81, 82, 84, 85, 102, 357
universal, xv, 4
valency, 300
vertex-deleted, 376
vertex-symmetric, 304
vertex-transitive, 305
walk, 199
weak embedding, xiv
weighted, 372
W-random, 353
XY-property, 404
graphon, 261, 353
Gravin, N., 209
Gray code, 287
Gray, R., 248
Griess Jnr., R. L., 135, 381
Grishkov, A. N., xxv, 277, 388, 390
Gromov, M., 357
Grothendieck, A., 192
group
abelian, 18, 37, 76, 100, 133, 156, 161, 231, 283, 290, 304, 384
abelian of exponent 3, 141
action, xxii, 25, 33, 38, 50, 57, 95, 100, 105, 175, 245, 255, 257, 264, 282, 283, 299, 304, 330, 377, 381
action
$\mathrm{Sym}(\mathfrak{r}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{g})$, 133
fixed-point-free, xxiv, 133, 135, 136, 139, 155, 162, 164
product, 51
affine, 38
almost automorphism, xxi, 48, 49, 118–120, 286, 343
almost free, 363

alternating, 50, 303
autohomeomorphisms of $\mathbb{Q}$, 179
automorphism, xvii, xviii, xx, xxiv, 10, 11, 13, 22, 24, 35, 40, 49, 64, 66, 82, 98, 102, 117, 130, 132, 133, 135, 137, 141, 146, 159–162, 165, 170, 171, 173, 174, 179, 184, 186, 213–216, 230, 231, 235, 249, 250, 256, 262, 264, 265, 271, 272, 274, 278, 284, 286, 295–297, 299–302, 304, 305, 309, 311, 314, 320, 325, 328, 330, 331, 335, 341, 344, 346, 356, 359–364, 367, 377, 380, 381, 384, 385, 391
B-group, 264, 298
base, 302
basic open, 358
biggest, 14, 18
bottom, 51, 58
bounded automorphisms, 304
braid, 75, 91, 121, 274, 282, 292, 293, 381
closed, 62–64, 305, 359
cofinality, 364
cofinitary, 57
cohomology, 42, 82
commensurable, 284
compact, 262, 302, 360
complete, 161
complex reflection, 273
congruence subgroup, 128, 283, 284
Conway, 132–134
core-free, 299, 300
Coxeter, 69, 83, 86, 274, 280
crystallographic (Bieberbach), 131
cyclic, 116, 161, 282, 303
$D(4)$, 140, 158, 279, 379, 382, 391
dense, 45, 145
diagonal, 296, 306
dicyclic, 264
discrete, 359
duality, 14, 17
elementary abelian, 11, 38, 58, 273, 289, 388
entire, 97
equivalence classes of
near-automorphisms, 166
exceptional, 380, 381, 383
extension-closed, 61
extremely amenable, 331
faithful action, 296
finitary, 57, 168, 169, 240
finite simple, 160
finite vertex index, 169, 177
first cohomology, 82
free, 86, 230, 344
free abelian, xxiv, 76, 131, 291, 304, 305, 344
free product, 86, 121, 123, 125, 280, 365
Fuchsian, 123
$G(2)$, 138, 139, 390
$G(2,2)$, 137
Galois, 99, 100
Grothendieck, 291
Hall-Janko, 135
highly homogeneous, 368
homeomorphisms of $\mathbb{Q}$, 179
hyperoctahedral, 91, 272, 293
inner mapping, 155
intransitive, 368
Klein, 37–39, 54, 87, 98, 141
Kleinian singularity, 382
Lie, 272, 379, 390, 391
linear, xvi
locally compact, 270, 302, 360
locally finite, 6, 61, 288, 389, 390
maximal, 297
maximal closed, 366
metabelian, 38
minimal closed normal subgroup, 367
modular, xxiv, 121, 127, 128, 255, 280, 284
Monster, 381
m-strand braid, 89
near automorphism, 166
near bijection, 165
near symmetries, 165
nilpotent, 37
non-split extension, 157
normal core, 299
oligomorphic, xvi, xvii, 60, 64, 371
open, 63, 64, 302, 359

open normal, 63
orbit, xvi
orthogonal, xxiv, 74, 133, 142, 390
orthogonal
  projective special, 376
permutation, 295, 342
permutation
  2-closed, 271, 305
  2-transitive, 11, 14, 16, 18, 45, 58, 82, 183, 269, 284, 295, 298–301, 306
  k-homogeneous, 295, 373
  k-transitive, 295, 373
  always exposable, 83
  AS-free, 269
  base, xviii
  closed, 62, 216, 221, 367
  closure, 309, 358
  cofinitary, 304
  degree, 49, 295
  generously k-transitive, 249
  generously transitive, 249, 267
  highly homogeneous, 284, 295
  highly transitive, xx, 19, 24, 45, 49, 97, 102, 171, 173, 179, 295
  imprimitive, 50, 51, 58, 60, 62, 63, 80, 283, 297, 370, 373
  infinite, 322
  invariant relations, 271
  multiply transitive, 54
  non-basic, 51
  non-closed, 364
  oligomorphic, xviii, 62, 210, 212, 214, 284, 304, 369
  orbit, 295
  orbital, 249
  pointwise stabilizer, 296
  primitive, xxii, 24, 37, 50–52, 58, 164, 284, 297–299, 303, 304, 311, 365, 366, 374, 375
  product, 60
  quasiprimitive, 299–301, 384
  reduct, 13
  regular, 296
  self-paired orbit, 249
  semiprimitive, 301
  semiregular, 11, 143, 144, 163, 244, 245, 296, 299, 301
  set-transitive, 249
  setwise stabilizer, 296
  stabilizer, xxii
  strongly synchronizing, 206
  suborbit, 216, 249, 250
  three-star, 250
  transitive, 37, 295
  transitive extension, 54
  wreath product, 60, 302
Philip Hall's, 6, 288
Polish, 64, 121, 231, 362
primitive, 240
principal congruence subgroup, 128
profinite, 62, 80, 100
projective linear, 179
reduct, xx, xxii
reflection, 86
regular, 116
regular normal subgroup, 38, 123, 297
simple, 160, 162, 298, 304, 342, 344, 380, 388, 390
$\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$, 128, 380
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$, 137
$\mathrm{SO}(8)$, 135, 138, 139, 376, 379, 390
socle, 298
spin, 134, 376, 390
$\mathrm{Spin}(8)$, 134, 139, 276, 376, 379
split extension, xxiv, 82, 123, 134, 143, 146, 156, 157, 162
Suzuki, 132, 135
switching, xxi, xxii, 10, 17, 293
switching
  automorphism, 10, 40, 44, 45
  closure of, 62
  enhanced, 61
  extended, 52, 58, 272
  finitary, xxii, 57
  full, 58
Sylow subgroup, 37, 38, 63
symmetric, xx, 105, 384
symmetric
  finitary, 303
  infinite, 212, 245, 344, 353, 360, 365–367
top, 58, 243, 302

topological, 36, 64, 231, 331, 358
topological
Polish, 362
totally disconnected, 62
torsion -free, 364
torsion-free, 128, 284, 306
totally disconnected, 270, 302
transitive, 240
triality, 16, 22
triality-simple, 389
triangle, 123
Tsaranov, 69, 76, 83
Weyl, 69, 74, 76, 99, 272, 274
with operators, 140
with triality, xxiv, 140, 151, 156, 387, 390
with triality
universal, 387
Young subgroup, 98, 99
zero vertex index, 169, 177
growth rates, 108, 375
G-space, 295
Gutman, Y., 331

Hall cube, 288
Hall, J. I., 158, 388, 389
Hall, P., 6, 288
Hamiltonian cycle, 287
Hamming code, 277
Hamming space, 287
Harary, F., 349
Harries, D., 83
Harrington, L., 339
Hasse diagram, 19, 24, 29, 192
Hausdorff paradox, 255
Hausdorff space, 64, 194, 215, 331, 407
Hausdorff, F., 216, 255
Hecke algebra, 91, 292, 293
Hecke ring, 251
Henkin, L., 308
Henson, C. W., 32, 120, 258
hereditary property, 324
Herwig, B., 145, 230
Hewitt, P. R., 361
Higman, D. G., xxii, 11, 269, 311, 346
Hilbert function, 370
Hilbert series, 368, 370, 371
Hilbert space, 229
HNN-construction, 306
Hodges, W., 363
Holmes, R., 246
holomorph, 297
homo-amalgamation property (HAP), 210
homo-extension property, 210
homo-Fraïssé class, 211
homomorphism density, 352
Hoover, D., 261, 353
Hopf algebra, 276
Hopf, H., 381
Howard, P., 393
Hrushovski, E., xvii, 145, 164, 230, 235, 330, 356, 362
Hubička, J., 330
Huntingdon, E. V., 216
hypercube, 286
hypergraph, 264, 363
hypermetric space, 248
hyperquasigroup, 280

I-property, 2, 24, 32, 125, 228, 233, 236, 264, 345
icosian ring, 135, 280
ideal, 285, 365
independence property, 314, 350
index of near-bijection, 166
integral domain, 97
intersection matrix, 70, 74, 77
invariant ring, 371
isolated point, 180
Ivanov, A. A., 84

Janson, S., 352, 353
Jech, T., 242
joint embedding property, 324, 363
Jones, G. A., 226, 282
Jordan
exceptional algebra, 380, 381
Jordan–Wielandt Theorem, 240, 303
Joyal, Á., 329, 374, 376
Junker, M., 223

K-Theory, 292
Königsberg bridge problem, xiii
Kac-Moody algebra, 75, 275, 381
Kantor, W. M., 235, 382

Kechris, A. S., 282, 331, 364
Kelarev, A., 147
Kelly, P. J., 375
Klein, F., 311
Kleitman, D. J., 259
Knight, R. W., 363
Kolmogorov, A. N., xix, 318, 348
Komjáth, P., 345
Kostant, B., 382
Krasner algebra, 271
Krivelevich, M., 350
Krön, B., 302
Kun, G., 34
Kurosh subgroup theorem, 121

Löwenheim, L., 216, 308, 310
Lachlan, A. H., 200, 245, 247, 265, 330, 344
Lachlan-Woodrow Theorem, 245, 247, 344
Laflamme, C., xxv, 187
Lagrange's Theorem, xxv
language, 306
Lascar, D., 145, 230
Latin square, 383
Latin square design, 386, 388
lattice, xxiv, 129, 304
Lattice
  Euclidean, 274
lattice
  ADE, 129
  commensurable, 284
  Euclidean, 74
  Leech, 129, 131, 274, 305, 381
  Leech
    complex, xxiv, 136
    icosian, 135
    octonionic, 279
    quaternionic, 135
    roots, 274
  partition, 269
  positive-definite, 129
  projective class, 284
  root, 69, 73, 129
  roots, 129
  shell, 129
Law of Large Numbers, 317, 319, 415
leading monomial, 371
Leiderman, A., 231
Lepowski, J., 136
Li, C. H., 305
Lie algebra, 133, 158, 272, 377
Lie algebra
  free, 275, 276
Lie algebras with triality, 277, 390
Liebeck, H., 83
Liebeck, M. W., 83, 235, 271, 388
linear order, xiv, 223, 265, 282, 296, 314, 331, 334, 335, 356, 357
locally finite field, 389
loop, 147–149, 383, 384
loop
  central automorphism, 386
  inner mapping group, 256, 384
  isotopic, 388
  multiplication group, 256, 383
  normal subloop, 384
  right transversal, 257
  simple, 384
  subloop, 384
  translation map, 383
Lorentzian lattice, 274
Lovász, L., 262, 352, 353
lower density
  of zero-one sequences, 317
Łuczak, T., 384

Mašulović, D., 217–220
Macpherson, H. D., xxiv, 6, 121, 145, 166, 173, 230, 235, 248, 258, 284, 285, 328, 356, 364, 365, 367, 374
magma, 257, 383
Mallows, C. L., 11, 71, 83
Mallows-Sloane Theorem, 12, 43
Markov chain, 347
Marsh, R., 78
matroid theory, 272
maximal subgroup, 365
McDonough, T. P., 365
meagre, 314
measure, 33, 48, 118, 229, 270, 316, 317
measure
  Borel, 316
  exchangeable, 258, 260
  invariant, 256, 317, 321, 353
  probability (normalized), 316

support, 316
transformation of, 317
measure-preserving map, 347
measureable set, 316
Mekler's criterion, 179
Mekler, A., 179, 285
Merola, F., 375
metric space, 235, 289, 290, 305, 323, 330
metric space
complete, 64, 124
connected, 62
countable homogeneous, 248
integral, 195, 228, 235
random
cyclic, 286
Meurman, A., 136
Milnor, J., 382
mimicking property, 184
Mnukhin, V., 376
Möbius function, 99
Möbius inversion, 134
model theory, xvi–xviii, 173, 210, 212, 223, 233, 235, 304, 306, 308–310, 313, 314, 330, 340, 361
modus ponens, 308
moiety, 47
Möller, R., 270, 302
monoid, 101, 202
monoid
closure, 204
oligomorphic, 217, 218
synchronizing, 202, 203
transformation, 202, 203
Monster
module, 381
monstrous moonshine, 284
Morita equivalence, 223
Morley's Theorem, xvi
Moss, L. S., xiv, 231, 236
Moufang
3-net, 388
bi-multiplication, 155
centre, 151, 386
commutative loop (CML), 385
homomorphism, 386
inner mapping group, 155
isotopy class, 388
loop, xxiv, xxv, 149, 279, 379, 385, 388
Moufang centre, 151, 386
Moufang nucleus, 151
nucleus, 386
Moufang loop, 389
Moufang's theorem, 150
Moufang, R., 385

Nagy, G. P., 388
Nešetřil, J., 15, 34, 200, 330
Neumann, П. M., 179, 248, 298, 303, 366
NF set theory, 245
Nguyen Van Thé, L., 331
Niemeier, H-V, 129
Nim field, 287
Noetherian ring, 368
number field, 99

O'Nan, M., 51, 297
O'Nan–Scott Theorem, 51, 297
octonions, 137, 158, 279, 381–383, 390
one-point extension property, xxiv, 2, 137, 167, 228, 229, 345
open ball, 124, 125, 229, 330, 358
open set, 179–181, 183–186, 192, 194, 215, 314, 316–318, 358, 362, 407
open set
full, 187
Orbit-Counting Lemma, 296
Orbit-Stabilizer Theorem, 11, 55, 296
Osgood, W., 314

Pach, J., 232, 345
Paige loop, 388, 390
Paris, J., 339
partition
G-invariant, 299
Patel, R., 263, 326
Peano arithmetic, 255, 337, 339, 340
Peano's axioms, 334, 338, 339
Pech, M., 217–220
permutation
flexible, 245
permutation matrix, 273
permutation model, 242

permutation representation, 295
permutation structure, 361
Pestov, V., 194, 282, 331
Petrov, F. V., 262, 321, 326
Phillips, J. D., 151, 384
pigeonhole property, 4, 238, 251
pigeonhole property
  generalized, 254
Pinsker, M., xxvi, 190, 217, 221, 223, 272, 282, 357
Point, F., 223
Polish space, 229, 230, 322, 362
polymorphism, 222
polynomial algebra, 97, 99, 102, 108, 318, 322, 347, 348, 350, 358, 367–371
polynomial invariant, 370
Pongrácz, A., 282
Pouzet, M., xxv, 5, 32, 108, 187, 369, 371, 375
Praeger, C. E., 147, 173, 248, 271, 305
preorder, 290
Presburger arithmetic, 337
Presburger, Mojżesz, 337
Prest, M., 223
probability space, 317, 347, 353
profile
  orbital, 371
projective line, 283
projective plane, 39
proof, 308
pseudo-reflection, 273
pseudograph, 199
pseudoreduct, 24
Pyber, L., 384

quadratic number field, 393
quadratic reciprocity, 225
quantifier elimination (q.e.), xvii, 220, 312, 313
quasi-Coxeter element, 76
quasi-isometry, 302
quasigroup, 146, 257, 280, 298, 383, 384
quasigroup
  autotopy, 385
  homotopy, 384
  isotopy, 384, 390
Quine, W., 245

Rödl, V., 15
Rényi, A., xiii, 5, 14, 321, 332, 347, 348, 350, 353, 354
Rado, R., xv, 2
Ramsey theorem, 47, 331
Ramsey theory, 15, 32, 106, 120, 330, 339, 340, 357
random variable, 317
Rapoport, A., xiii
Razborov, A. A., 353
reconstruction, 108, 375
reduct, 13, 308, 357
reduct
  biggest, 14, 24
  duality, 14, 24
  irreducible, 18
  pseudoreduct, 24
  reducible, 18
  switching, 14, 24
  trivial, 19
regeneration in random structures, 325
Reidemeister, K, 61, 88
Reidemeister-Schreier algorithm, 61, 88
relation algebra, 271
relational language, 309
relational structure, xv, xvii–xx, 33, 40, 49, 102, 103, 107, 108, 173, 200, 210, 213–215, 238, 253, 271, 286, 309, 311, 323, 324, 328, 329, 346, 349, 355, 356, 359, 361, 362, 368–372, 375
relational structure
  age-inexhaustible, 369
  almost age-inexhaustible, 369
  kernel, 369
  monomorphic, 371
representation
  irreducible, 379
residual set, 314
reverse mathematics, 339
Richman, F., 285, 366
right regular representation, 296
ring of geometries, 103
ring of invariants, 370
Riordan, O., 353

Robinson arithmetic, 337
Robinson, A., 313
Robinson, R. M., 337
Rose, B. I., xvii
Rosendal, C., 364
Rothschild, B. L., 259
Rubin, J. E., 393
Rubin, M., 161, 342, 344, 362
rules of inference, 308
Ryll-Nardzewski, C., xviii, 217, 310, 341

S-duality, 380
Sós, V. T., 352
Sabidussi's Theorem, 301
Sabisussi, G., 147, 201, 301
Sauer, N., xxv, 5, 32, 106, 187, 205, 254, 291
Schmerl, J. H., 330
Schreier's method, 122
Schreier, J., 239
Schreier, O., 61, 88, 122
Schrijver, A., 353
Schur ring (S-ring), 298
Schur, I, 120
Scott, E., 346
Scott, L., 51, 297
second category, 314
Segre variety, 372
Seidel switching, 10, 356
Seidel, J. J., xx, xxii, xxiii, 10, 11, 50, 69, 76, 81, 84
self-similarity, 254
semigroup, 147, 201, 202, 213, 223, 291, 383
sentence, 307
sentence
  inductive, 355
separation condition
  T_1, 174, 184, 185
separation property, 62
Seress, Á., 305
sets
  basic open, 36, 184, 185, 187, 193, 194, 213, 215, 362
  comeagre, 314, 318
  separated, 407
  topologically distinguishable, 407
sf-universal, 121
Shelah, S., 33, 350, 360
Shephard, G. C., 273
Shi, N., 33
Sierpiński's Theorem, 180, 182, 186
Sierpiński, Waclaw, 180, 182, 315
σ-algebra, 315
σ-field, 317
signed cycle, 73
signed cycle
  balance, 73
  parity, 73
signing
  even, 71
simplicial complex, 238
singularity theory, 71
Skolem arithmetic, 337
Skolem, T., 216, 308, 310, 335, 337
Sloane, N. J. A., 11, 71, 83
Slodowy, P., 74
Smale, S., 118
small index property (SIP), xvii, 146, 164, 362, 363
small index property, strong, 164, 363
Smith, J. D. H., 271, 280, 384
smoothly approximable structure, 235
Sobrani, M., 369
Sochor, A., 242
space
  of random structures, 348
  totally disconnected, 62
species, 329, 374
Spencer, J., xviii, xx, xxviii, 348, 350, 358
spinor (spin representation), 134, 137, 377, 380
split-octonions, 279, 388, 390
splitting field, 100, 270
square-root set, 125, 298
square-root set
  non-principal, 298
stability, 313
standard signature, 74
Stirling number
  generalised, 374
  of first kind, 113
  of second kind, 104, 113, 373

Stone, M., 205, 291
Stone–Čech compactification, xxv, 192, 194
strict order property, 314
strictly minimal set, 173
Strong Mekler Criterion, 184
strongly mixing system, 321
structure, 307
structure
  λ-saturated, 309
  almost stabilizer, 286
  bi-interpretable, 312, 361
  countably categorical, 2
  generic, 33, 35, 364
  group-categorical, 161
  homo-equivalent, 211
  homogeneous, xiii, xiv, 309, 323
  homogenizable, 35
  homomorphism-homogeneous, 217–219
  homomorphism-universal, xiv
  indivisible, 32, 285
  inexhaustible, 106
  model-complete, 357
  primitive positive interdefinable, 222
  profile, 370
  pseudo-homogeneous, 328
  Ramsey, 32
  slow-growing, 351
  strong embedding property, 326
  universal, xiii, 355
  weakly oligomorphic, 218, 219
  with no algebraicity, 161
  XY-property, 200
Study, E., 277, 379
submodel, 308
substructure, 308
Sudakov, B., 350
sum-free set, 120
Svenonius, L., xviii, 217, 310, 341
switching
  Seidel, 10, 356
switching
  G-restricted, 43
  bipartite, 24
  class, 10, 11
  local, 69, 75
  operation, 10, 33, 43, 46, 82, 275
  signed, 72
  signed class, 69
  signed class spectrum, 73
symmetric function, 108, 352
symmetric function
  elementary, 99
  monomial, 99
symmetric polynomial, 370
system
  complete, 308
  sound, 308
system of imprimitivity, 297, 304
Szegedy, B., 262, 352
Szendrei, Á., 272

3-net, 386
Tao, Terence, 322
Tarski, A., 255, 306
Teague, D. N., 298
Tent, K., 258, 328
term, 307
The Paris-Harrington Theorem, 255, 340
theorem, 308
theory, 307, 323
theory
  λ-categorical, 310
  bi-interpretable, 216, 361
  model-complete, 313, 357
  totally categorical, 310
  unstable, 313
theta-function, 134
Thiéry, N. M., 371, 375
Thomas' Theorem, xxii, 13, 14, 22, 28, 188, 221, 349, 357
Thomas, S., xx, 13, 14, 22, 24, 28, 32, 174, 264, 365, 366
Thomson series, 284
threshold function, 350
Thurston, W. P., 127
Tits, J., 135, 383
Todd, J. A., 273
Todorcevic, S., 282, 331
togs, 73
topological
  group, 18
  monoid, 215

topological dynamics, 330, 331
topological group, 62, 80, 179, 361–363, 382
topological group
  Hausdorff, 214, 360
  totally disconnected, 62, 186
  universal, 62
topological space, 124, 132, 136, 152, 180, 192, 193, 316, 358
topological space
  0-dimensional, 180
  R_i, 407
  T_1, 62, 180
  T_i, 407
  compact, 192
  completely metrizable, 362
  dense, 362
  metrizable, 180
  second countable, 180
  separable, 359
topology, 175, 181, 184, 185, 187, 192, 282, 315–317, 319, 362
topology
  discrete, 64, 183, 192–194, 213, 359
  Hausdorff, 174, 184, 214, 360
  locally compact, 215
  natural, 35, 213, 221, 305, 358
  neighbourhood, 174, 176, 184, 186
  of pointwise convergence, 35, 63, 64, 66, 145, 194, 213, 215, 221, 358, 363
  order, 182
  totally disconnected, 186
tournament, 252, 253, 264
tournament
  random, 225, 252, 253, 265, 364
  transitive, 253
transitive extension, 369
transitive extension
  curious, 56
  weak, 54
tree, 71, 84
tree
  rooted, 275
triality identity, 140–142, 387, 391
Trofimov, V. I., 230, 304, 305
Truss, J. K., xx, 36, 48, 179, 182, 239, 242, 342, 356, 363, 393
Tsankov, T., 331
Tsaranov, S. V., 69, 83, 84
T-structure, 234
tuple, 309
Turing, A., 339
2-complex, 127
two-graph, xx, 11, 28, 41, 55, 56, 58, 64, 71, 73, 77, 81, 82, 84, 85, 102, 357
two-graph
  first invariant, 82
  oriented, 265
  universal homogeneous, 266
type, 216, 309
k-type, 309
type over $\varnothing$, 309
type over a model, 309
type over a theory, 309

ubiquitous in category, 329
ubiquity, 329
Ulam, S., 239
ultrafilter, 174, 192, 285, 365
ultrafilter
  equivalent, 365
  nonprincipal, 175
  principal, 192, 365
  uniform, 365
upper density
  of zero-one sequences, 317
Upward Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem, 216, 310, 341
Urysohn space, 228, 230, 231, 286, 289, 290, 358
Uspenskij, V., 330

valuation, 307
Van Lint, J. H., xx
variable
  bound, 307
  free, 307
Vershik, A. M., 229–231, 262, 321, 326, 358
vertex index, 169
Vesztergombi, K., 352
Vojtěchovský, P., 388

Wagner, F. O., 330
weak $\forall\exists$ interpretation, 362

Weisfeiler, B., 269
Weiss, B., 331
Wells, A. L. jun., 71
Welzl, E., 201
Whitney's Theorem, 161
Wielandt, H., 248, 271, 298
Wilson, R. A., 135, 279
Winkler, P., 358
Witt representation, 70
Woodrow, R. E., xvii, xxv, 187, 200, 245, 247, 344, 367
wreath product, 25, 66, 104, 105
wreath product
  full, 303
  restricted, 303

Yang-Baxter equation, 293

Zara, F., 279
Zaslavsky, T., 71, 73
Zavarnitsine, A. V., xxv, 388
Zelevinsky, A., 78
Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, xvii, 334, 338
zero-divisor, 368
zero-one law, xix, 346, 348–351, 358
zero-one sequence, 116–118, 121, 228, 260, 317, 358
Zhu, X., 106
Ziegler, M., 223
Zil'ber's Trichotomy Theorem, 310
Zil'ber, B. I., 310